

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_164184

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

The I.L.O.

The International Labour Organisation is an association of nations, financed by Governments and democratically controlled by representatives of Governments, of management and of labour organisations.

Its purpose is to promote social justice in all the countries of the world. To this end it collects facts about labour and social conditions, formulates minimum international standards, and supervises their national application.

The machinery of the Organisation consists of:

The International Labour Office, which acts as a secretariat, a world information centre, and a publishing house. It is staffed by experts drawn from many different countries, whose knowledge, experience and advice are available to all the nations which are members of the Organisation. It has branch offices and correspondents in many countries.

The Governing Body, composed of 16 Government representatives, 8 representatives of management and 8 representatives of labour, which is the executive council of the Organisation and exercises general supervision over the work of the Office and frames its budget.

The International Labour Conference, which is a world parliament for labour and social questions. Each national delegation to the annual meetings comprises four delegates, two representing the Government, one representing management, and one representing labour; each of these three sections speaks and votes independently, so that all points of view find full expression.

The Conference adopts minimum international standards which are formulated in special international treaties called *Conventions*, and in *Recommendations*. These are based on careful fact-finding and discussion. As a two-thirds majority of the Conference is required for their adoption, they represent the general agreement of informed world opinion. Since the first Conference in 1919 the Conference has adopted 67 Conventions and 66 Recommendations. These deal with hours of work, paid vacations, the protection of women and children, prevention and compensation of industrial accidents, insurance against unemployment, sickness, old age and death, colonial labour problems, conditions of seamen, etc. The substantive provisions of the Conventions and Recommendations, together with other documents and information relating to international labour standards, have been brought together in a volume entitled *The International Labour Code*, published by the Office in 1941. (Price \$5; 15s.)

The decisions of the Conference are not automatically binding. Governments must submit the Conference standards to their national legislatures. If a legislature accepts a Convention, the Government is bound to apply the Convention and to submit an annual report showing how it is applying it, which is scrutinised by special I.L.O. committees.

The New York Conference of 1941, at which 34 States Members of the Organisation were represented, adopted resolutions entrusting to the Organisation the duty of giving authoritative expression to the social objective in the rebuilding of a peaceful world on the basis of the Atlantic Charter.

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE

STUDIES AND REPORTS

Series P (Seamen) No. 5

MERCHANT SEAMEN AND THE WAR

**Record of the Twelfth Session of the
Joint Maritime Commission**

London, 26-30 June 1942

MONTREAL, 1943

**PUBLISHED BY THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE,
3480 University Street, Montreal, Canada**

**Published in the United Kingdom for the INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE
by P. S. King & Staples, Ltd., London.**

**Distributed in the United States by the INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE,
Washington Branch, 734 Jackson Place, Washington, D.C.**

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
PART I. <i>Report of the Acting Director of the International Labour Office</i> . . .	4
PART II. <i>Attendance at the Session</i>	25
PART III. <i>Resolutions adopted</i>	29
PART IV. <i>Record of Proceedings</i>	34
Opening of the Session	34
Report of the Acting Director	37
General Discussion	37
Ratification of Conventions	41
Composition of the Joint Maritime Commission	67
Appointment of a Consultative Sub-Committee	69
Safety Measures	70
Welfare	108
Equality of Treatment of Seafarers	128
International Maritime Charter	145
Conditions of Service of Seafarers	148
Organisation of Merchant Fleets	149
International Agreement on the Utilisation of Merchant Shipping	149
The Shipping Industry and the Peace Conference	151
Closing Speeches	151

INTRODUCTION

The Twelfth Session of the Joint Maritime Commission was convened in accordance with a decision taken by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office at its Ninetieth Session, held in New York in October and November 1941. The Governing Body then decided that in view of the long interval that had elapsed since the previous meeting of the Commission (in Paris in March 1935) and the many important developments, including of course the outbreak of war, that had taken place in the meantime, a meeting of the Commission should be held if both sides of the Commission—the representatives of shipowners and those of seamen—agreed that a meeting would be desirable. This agreement was speedily forthcoming, and the Commission was accordingly convened to meet in London in the latter half of June 1942 with an agenda confined to two subjects, namely:

1. The Report of the Acting Director of the International Labour Office on the maritime work of the Office since the previous session of the Commission;
2. Wartime conditions and merchant seamen.

The Commission met in London on 26–30 June 1942. As was inevitable in war conditions, the organisation of the meeting presented difficulties; many of the representatives of shipowners and seafarers who had been most eminent and active in the work of the Commission in the past were unable to attend and measures had to be taken to replace them, and the preparatory work had to be undertaken under the handicap of the circumstances that had led to a drastic reduction in the staff of the Office and the transfer of the majority of the remainder from Geneva, Switzerland, to Montreal, Canada. These difficulties and the steps taken to overcome them are briefly indicated in the Report of the Acting Director of the Office, which is reproduced as Part I of this volume, while the fact that despite the war it proved possible to gather a widely representative meeting is amply demonstrated by the list of members, deputies, substitutes and advisers which is given in Part II.

Sittings of the Commission are always held in private and the minutes of its proceedings are confidential documents which receive only a limited circulation within the International Labour Organisa-

tion. The publication of this record of the Twelfth Session is without precedent and cannot be regarded as constituting a precedent for future sessions of the Commission. It is, however, justified by the quite exceptional circumstances in which the Session was held. The Commission had not met for several years, and this Session was held in the midst of a world war to the successful prosecution of which the shipping industry was making a contribution of vital importance. There was naturally widespread interest in the work of the Commission both in the shipping industry and among the general public. In these circumstances it seemed desirable that Governments, the shipping industry and the public should be given something more than a mere statement of the decisions reached and should be enabled to appreciate the considerations on which those decisions were based and the spirit of mutual understanding which inspired all the members of the Commission and resulted, after frank but friendly discussion, in unanimous agreement on all the proposals before them. The record appearing in Part IV of this volume has accordingly been prepared from the verbatim report of the Session.

The record is not, however, a mere reproduction of the verbatim report. The Commission adopted a special procedure; proposals from either side were submitted first in a more or less provisional form, they were explained by their sponsors, but a decision was deferred to a later sitting and in the meantime informal discussions took place, supplementary explanations were furnished and alternative proposals formulated and revised, until finally the proposals reached a form that was generally acceptable. A sitting-by-sitting account of the discussions would therefore read very disconnectedly, and accordingly the record has been arranged so as to bring together into a continuous account the discussions relating to each topic. Some of the discussions have been summarised, but the important speeches have been given with no material abridgment. In the case, however, of the discussion on the proposal to change the composition of the Joint Maritime Commission, which though of great importance to the International Labour Organisation is of less public interest at the present stage, only a very brief summary is given, a full report being reserved for the minutes of the Commission which, in accordance with its Standing Orders, will be presented to the Governing Body of the Office.

The resolutions adopted by the Commission are reproduced in Part III of this volume. By authority of the Emergency Committee of the Governing Body, the texts of the resolutions dealing with the ratification of International Labour Conventions, safety measures for seamen, organisation for seamen's welfare and equality

of treatment of seafarers were communicated to the Governments of the Members of the International Labour Organisation without delay, by circular letter despatched from Montreal on 31 July 1942 (within a month, that is, of the closing of the Session of the Commission) and the "summary statement" on safety measures requested by the Commission in one of these resolutions was prepared and issued in December 1942.¹ The other resolutions adopted by the Commission will be submitted in due course to the Governing Body or its Emergency Committee.

¹ INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE, Studies and Reports, Series P (Seamen) No. 4: *Life-Saving Measures for Merchant Seamen in Time of War* (Montreal, 1943).

PART I

Report of the Acting Director of the International Labour Office

1. The Joint Maritime Commission held its Eleventh Session in Paris in March 1935. A summary account of the results of that session and of the subsequent work of the International Labour Organisation in the field of maritime labour will be given below. It will be seen that considerable progress was made in carrying out the recommendations of the Commission. Not only this work but all the work of the International Labour Office was of course interrupted by the war. However, as soon as possible after the main services of the Office had been moved to Montreal steps were taken to convene a Conference of the International Labour Organisation so that the Office might secure support and guidance as regards its activities during the world crisis. That Conference, attended by the representatives of 35 countries, placed on record its emphatic conviction that the victory of the free peoples in the war against totalitarian aggression was the indispensable condition of the attainment of the ideals of the Organisation and, at the same time, gave the Office a general reconstruction mandate. The present meeting of the Joint Maritime Commission to consider wartime labour problems therefore tends to carry out one of the major preoccupations of the Conference.

THE JOINT MARITIME COMMISSION AND MARITIME SESSIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

2. In view of the length of time which has elapsed since the last Session of the Commission and the number of newcomers at the present Session, it will probably be found convenient to give a brief account of the history of the Commission.

Maritime questions have taken a special place in the work of the International Labour Organisation ever since its origin. The Commission on International Labour Legislation set up by the Peace Conference in 1919, when drawing up the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation, adopted a resolution stating that "the very special questions concerning the minimum conditions to be accorded to seamen might be dealt with at a special

meeting of the International Labour Conference devoted exclusively to the affairs of seamen". When the International Labour Conference itself met in its First Session at Washington in October and November 1919 and adopted the Hours of Work (Industry) Convention, it included transport by sea and inland waterways within the scope of that Convention but decided also to add to Article 1 of the Convention a paragraph stipulating that "the provisions relative to transport by sea and on inland waterways shall be determined by a special conference dealing with employment at sea and on inland waterways". In January of the following year the Governing Body of the International Labour Office decided to convene the Second Session of the Conference as a special Seamen's Conference, to be held at Genoa in June 1920; and at its next meeting, in March 1920, the Governing Body decided that "a Joint Commission of twelve members should be appointed, consisting of five shipowners and five seamen chosen by the Genoa Conference and two members chosen by the Governing Body. This Commission will assist the technical maritime service of the Labour Office and will be consulted on questions of maritime labour. It will meet when convoked by the Chairman of the Governing Body, who will preside at its deliberations." The final stage in the establishment of the tradition of special consideration and special machinery for maritime questions was the adoption by the Genoa Conference of a resolution in the following terms: "Seeing that misunderstanding may arise as to the position of those employed in the Mercantile Marine with regard to Conventions and Recommendations to be passed by International Labour Conferences, it is hereby resolved that no such Conventions or Recommendations shall apply to those employed in the Mercantile Marine unless they have been passed as a special maritime question on the agenda. All questions on maritime affairs put forward for consideration by conferences should be previously considered by the Joint Maritime Commission of the International Labour Office."

3. The Joint Maritime Commission held its First Session at Geneva in November 1920, and since then it has been regularly consulted by the Governing Body on all matters of maritime interest, including those which were placed on the agenda of the special maritime sessions of the Conference. Sessions of the Commission were held in 1922, 1923, 1924, 1925, 1926, 1927, 1928, 1929, 1933 and 1935, and maritime sessions of the Conference in 1926, 1929 and 1936. In addition a tripartite technical meeting preparatory to the 21st Session of the Conference was held in Geneva in 1935.

4. Thus for over twenty years representatives of shipowners and seamen have met with members of the Governing Body in the Joint Maritime Commission and with delegates of Governments in the Conference to discuss matters affecting employment at sea, and as a result of their joint labours the Conference has adopted thirteen Conventions and eight Recommendations for the regulation of maritime employment. (For the list of Conventions, see Appendix II.)

ELEVENTH SESSION OF THE JOINT MARITIME COMMISSION, PARIS, MARCH 1935

5. At the 13th Session of the International Labour Conference (1929) four maritime questions had been the subject of a first discussion, namely: (1) Regulation of hours of work on board ship; (2) The protection of seamen in case of sickness, including the treatment of seamen injured on board ship; (3) Promotion of seamen's welfare in ports; (4) Minimum requirement of professional capacity in the case of captains, navigating and engineer officers in charge of watches on board merchant ships. The primary purpose for which the 11th Session of the Joint Maritime Commission was convened was to consider how the question of manning could be linked to the first of the questions dealt with in first discussion at the 1929 Conference. The Commission decided to request the Governing Body of the International Labour Office: (a) to place the question of manning on the agenda of the next maritime session of the Conference with a view to examination of the problem of hours of work on board ship and manning, as a whole; (b) to convene a preparatory technical tripartite meeting to consider the question of manning in conjunction with hours of work and also the question of holidays with pay for seamen; (c) to convene a maritime session of the Conference in the autumn of 1936 with an agenda including all the questions on which a first discussion had taken place in 1929 with the addition of the questions of manning and holidays with pay.

PREPARATORY MARITIME MEETING, 1935

6. The proposals of the Joint Maritime Commission were approved by the Governing Body in April 1935, and a preparatory technical tripartite meeting was accordingly held at Geneva from 25 November to 6 December 1935. Members of the Organisation possessing more than 250,000 tons gross of sea-going shipping, excluding vessels of under 100 tons, were invited to send three representatives (one each for the Government, the shipowners and the seamen, with advisers), the Governing Body itself being

represented by three of its members and members of the Commission who were not included in their national delegations being given the opportunity to attend in an advisory capacity. Of the twenty-four Members invited, sixteen sent delegations to the meeting, the countries represented being: the United States of America, Belgium, the British Empire, China, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, India, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and Yugoslavia. For the purpose of the discussions at this meeting the International Labour Office issued in September and October 1935 two reports (white reports) on Hours of Work on Board Ship and Manning and on Holidays with Pay for Seamen respectively. The report and record of the meeting itself were published by the Office in 1936.

7. During the preparatory meeting the Joint Maritime Commission was consulted by the Governing Body upon the question of placing on the agenda of a special maritime session of the Conference the question of the revision of the Convention fixing the minimum age of employment at sea. The Commission agreed to this being done, in the event of the Governing Body deciding to place the question of the revision of the other Minimum Age Conventions on the agenda of the Conference, and the Governing Body took action accordingly (see par. 9 below).

TWENTY-FIRST AND TWENTY-SECOND (MARITIME) SESSIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

8. The ground was thus prepared for the holding of the special maritime sessions of the International Labour Conference which were held in Geneva from 6 to 24 October 1936. These sessions were attended by 97 delegates and 137 technical advisers, representing 33 States with an aggregate of 54 million gross tons of shipping (excluding vessels of not more than 100 tons), or 83 per cent. of the total world tonnage.

9. The agenda of the 21st Session, as fixed by the Governing Body on the basis of the previous discussions and decisions, was as follows:

- I. A.—Regulation of hours of work on board ship.
B.—Manning in conjunction with hours of work on board ship.
- II. Protection of seamen in case of sickness (including the treatment of seamen injured on board ship), *i.e.*:
 - (a) The individual liability of the shipowner towards sick or injured seamen;
 - (b) Sickness insurance for seamen.

III. Promotion of seamen's welfare in ports.

IV. Establishment by each maritime country of a minimum requirement of professional capacity in the case of captains, navigating and engineer officers in charge of watches on board merchant ships.

V. Holidays with pay for seamen.

In addition, the Conference had before it reports by the Governing Body on the working of Maritime Conventions adopted at earlier sessions, namely No. 7, Minimum Age (Sea), 1920; No. 8, Unemployment Indemnity (Shipwreck), 1920; No. 9, Placing of Seamen, 1920; No. 15, Minimum Age (Trimmers and Stokers), 1921; No. 16, Medical Examination of Young Persons (Sea), 1921. Moreover, the shipowners' and seamen's groups at the Conference were called upon to renew the membership of the Joint Maritime Commission.

10. The agenda of the 22nd Session (which opened on 22 October 1936) was limited to the partial revision of the Minimum Age (Sea) Convention, 1920 (No. 7), in respect to the raising of the minimum age from 14 to 15 years and any related revision of the exceptions provided in the Convention and in respect to the "standard" articles of the Convention (so as to give these articles the new form adopted for more recent Conventions).

RESULTS OF THE 1936 MARITIME SESSIONS OF THE CONFERENCE

11. The 1936 sessions of the Conference adopted six Conventions and two Recommendations:

Convention No. 53: Officers' Competency Certificates.

" " 54: Holidays with Pay (Sea).

" " 55: Shipowners' Liability (Sick and Injured Seamen).

" " 56: Sickness Insurance (Sea).

" " 57: Hours of Work and Manning (Sea).

" " 58: Minimum Age (Sea) (Revised).

Recommendation No. 48: Seamen's Welfare in Ports.

" " 49: Hours of Work and Manning (Sea).

12. The Conference also adopted six resolutions, dealing with:

- (1) The placing on the agenda of the next maritime session of the Conference of the questions of the provision of compensation for accidents to seamen and of the provision of benefit or allowances for seamen involuntarily unemployed.
- (2) The convocation of an economic conference or conferences, under the auspices of the League of Nations, for the pur-

pose of removing, as far as possible, trade restrictions which were preventing economic recovery and constituted a special handicap to the shipping industry.

- (3) The placing on the agenda of the next maritime session of the Conference of the question of equality of treatment for national and foreign seamen.
- (4) An investigation and report to the Conference on the question of the abolition of the "contractor system" of employment of Chinese seamen.
- (5) Study of the accommodation of crews on board ship and of the possibility of international regulations and reciprocal agreements on the subject, these questions to be dealt with by the Joint Maritime Commission at a forthcoming session.
- (6) Periodic collection and compilation of information on the wages of seamen on sea-going merchant vessels of the principal maritime countries and all other matters relating to competitive conditions.

13. The shipowners' and seamen's groups at the 21st Session of the Conference agreed that it was desirable to increase from 7 to 9 the number of regular members in each group on the Joint Maritime Commission, with a corresponding increase in the number of deputy members, and elected their representatives on this basis. (These proposals were confirmed by the Governing Body in May 1937; the membership of the Commission, as constituted as a result of the 1936 elections and of changes made by the two groups subsequently, is given in Appendix I.)

PROGRESS OF RATIFICATIONS OF MARITIME CONVENTIONS

14. The progress made in the ratification of Conventions since the 1935 meeting of the Commission is shown in Appendix II, in full detail for the Conventions adopted in 1936 and more summarily for the earlier Conventions. It will be seen that three of the six Conventions adopted in 1936 have already come into force and that the earlier Conventions have been the subject of thirty-three ratifications in all since March 1935. In considering the progress achieved, allowance must be made for the fact that there must necessarily be an interval between the adoption of a Convention by the Conference and the beginning of the flow of ratifications, and that by the time this interval had elapsed after October 1936 the international situation had already become very menacing. The results so far secured must, in all the circumstances, be regarded as not unsatisfactory.

15. While war and the threat of war have retarded the flow of ratifications without, however, arresting it completely, there is evidence that Governments by no means lose sight of the Conventions even in the stress of war. The British Government, for example, has announced that while it would not be practicable to give effect during wartime to the Hours of Work and Manning Convention it regarded the matter as one which should receive renewed attention as soon as circumstances permit.¹ Switzerland, for which country the Maritime Conventions were of no practical interest at the time of their adoption and were therefore not ratified, has nevertheless given effect to the requirements of six of the earlier Conventions (Nos. 7, 8, 15, 16, 22 and 23) in the Order made by the Federal Government on 9 April 1941 for the regulation of the fleet of merchant ships it acquired to overcome war-time difficulties of transport. This action is a very gratifying testimony both to the loyalty of Switzerland to the Organisation and to the continuing practical value of the work of the maritime sessions of the Conference. Similarly, the systematic development of organisation for seamen's welfare in a number of countries is a tribute to the value of the Recommendation on that subject adopted by the Conference in 1936.

REPERCUSSIONS OF THE WAR UPON THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION

16. It is unnecessary to attempt to recapitulate here the full story of the effect of the war upon all the activities of the Organisation. The Office found itself compelled to effect a drastic reduction of its staff, to reduce the scale of its work, and finally, in the summer of 1940, to transfer most of its remaining staff from Geneva to Montreal. The ordinary session of the Conference convened for June 1940 and a number of committee meetings had to be abandoned, and for many months, after February 1940, it was not possible to hold a meeting of the Governing Body or of the Emergency Committee which it had set up in anticipation of the difficulties of convening the Governing Body itself in war conditions. After the transfer to Montreal, however, the Office succeeded in establishing something approaching normal relations with the Governments and employers' and workers' organisations of most of the Members of the Organisation and, though still much hampered by the smallness of its staff and by separation from the records and documents in Geneva, is picking up broken threads and resuming most of the activities, including maritime work, which had been interrupted.

¹ Statement by the Minister of Labour and National Service in the House of Commons, 5 February 1942.

17. The most impressive manifestation of the vitality of the Organisation despite the difficulties caused by the war was the holding of the special Conference and of a regular session of the Governing Body in New York in October and November 1941. (The last sitting of the Conference was held in the White House at Washington and was addressed by the President of the United States.) As already noted, the Conference was unanimous in its conviction that the victory of the free peoples in this war against totalitarian aggression is indispensable if the ideals of the International Labour Organisation are to be attained, and it devoted its discussions almost solely to consideration of the social problems created or intensified by the war and of the part which the Organisation could and should play in coping with the problems of post-war reconstruction. (An account of the Conference discussions on reconstruction, together with the chapters of the Report to the Conference by the Acting Director dealing with this subject, has been published by the Office under the title *Towards Our True Inheritance*.)

DECISIONS OF THE 1941 CONFERENCE AND THE GOVERNING BODY CONCERNING THE COMMISSION

18. The importance of the maritime industry, both in the war effort of the United Nations and in the reconstruction of a war-devastated world, was repeatedly emphasised during the Conference discussions and many speakers stressed the necessity for making preparations well in advance to meet the post-war situation. Some of the more important resolutions of the Conference, which directly or by implication raise questions of maritime interest, are reproduced in Appendix III of this report; it will be seen that in the preamble and in clause (d) of the first resolution there are specific references to the maritime industry and to the Joint Maritime Commission. In addition to the general resolutions the Conference adopted the following resolution dealing with planning for the regulation of economic and social conditions in the mercantile marine:

RESOLUTION ON PLANNING FOR THE REGULATION OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONDITIONS IN THE MERCANTILE MARINE

Whereas seafarers have made many sacrifices and shown great devotion to duty; and

Whereas the international character of shipping will become even more pronounced after the war than before; and

Whereas a speedy and satisfactory regulation of the economic and social position of seamen is therefore imperative for the future development of the shipping industry:

The Conference of the International Labour Organisation authorises the Director of the International Labour Office:

(a) To consult all interested organisations, institutions and individuals in order that at the end of the war plans will be available for the immediate regulation of economic and social conditions in the mercantile marine;

and

(b) To consult the Joint Maritime Commission regarding the desirability of the inclusion therein of Government representatives.

19. This resolution, with the others adopted by the Conference, was submitted to the Emergency Committee of the Governing Body when it met in London in April 1942, but no definite action was taken upon it until a meeting of the Joint Maritime Commission had taken place and had given the members of the Commission an opportunity of taking formal note of the resolution and expressing their views upon it if they so desired.

20. During 1941 suggestions were made that, in view of the long interval that had elapsed since the last meeting of the Joint Maritime Commission and the magnitude of the problems affecting the maritime industry created by the war, it would be desirable to hold a meeting of the Commission. Accordingly, the Governing Body decided, at its 90th Session, in New York, that the Commission should be convened if the representatives of both ship-owners and seamen on the Commission agreed upon the holding of a meeting.

CONVOCATION OF THE JOINT MARITIME COMMISSION

21. The organisation of a meeting of the Commission presented many difficulties, notably because many members of the Commission were not accessible owing to war conditions. Despite these difficulties, consultations took place between the shipowners' and seamen's members who could be reached, and an agreement was come to that the Commission should meet in London in the latter half of June 1942, for the purpose of considering this report and of discussing wartime conditions as they affect merchant seamen. It was also agreed by the members who could be reached that vacancies due to the inaccessibility or absence of members should be filled by substitutes appointed by the respective groups, applying by analogy the provision of the Commission's Standing Orders (designed of course for normal circumstances) which leaves to each group full freedom as to the manner of filling vacancies. The proposal to convene a meeting of the Commission in these conditions was reported to the Emergency Committee of the Governing Body when it met in London in April 1942 and was received with warm approval.

22. It has not been possible for the Office to prepare for this session of the Commission a complete set of documents to serve as a basis for its discussions; these would indeed have to be very voluminous if they were to cover effectively the wide range of problems with which the maritime industry is faced. The Office has, however, been able to prepare a certain number of documents which will be submitted to the Commission in addition to this report; these are:

Seamen's Welfare. Organisation for Seamen's Welfare in Great Britain (reprint of an article published in the *International Labour Review*, April 1941).

Organisation for Seamen's Welfare in Canada (The War and Merchant Seamen: III).
Supplementary Note on Seamen's Welfare (Roneoed document, J.M.C. 1942/1).

Safety. Life-Saving Appliances (The War and Merchant Seamen: II).

Compensation for War Losses. Unemployment Indemnities and Compensation for Loss of Effects; Detention and Family Allowances (The War and Merchant Seamen: I).

Stabilisation of Employment. Continuity of Service (The War and Merchant Seamen: IV).

The preparation of other papers was contemplated by the Office but it is unlikely that this work can be completed in time for submission to the meeting. Members of the Commission have therefore been asked to assist the Office by themselves supplying brief notes on topics on which they wish to initiate discussion. The Office has also prepared a booklet giving, under the title *The International Seamen's Code*, the texts of all the Conventions and Recommendations of maritime interest which have so far been adopted by the Conference.

FUTURE MARITIME WORK OF THE ORGANISATION

23. The Office does not venture to announce to the Commission any definite programme of work on maritime matters for the future, considering it necessary rather to await, before it formulates proposals for submission to the Governing Body or its Emergency Committee, the authoritative guidance and suggestions which the

Commission will be able to give at the present Session. Both the Governing Body and the Office are very keenly alive to the importance, now greater than ever, of maritime questions and will undoubtedly make every possible effort to ensure as adequate a treatment of them in the general programme of work of the Organisation as circumstances permit.

24. Reference is made in the Resolution of the New York Conference quoted in paragraph 18 above to the sacrificial devotion to duty of merchant seamen in the present conflict. The Commission will undoubtedly wish to place on record, during the course of its session, its own tribute to the brave men on whose behalf it speaks and whose interests it is meeting to safeguard and promote, but it would not be proper for a report on behalf of the International Labour Office to close without some expression, in however inadequate language, of gratitude to the men of the merchant marine. Month after month, in cold, in heat, in wind and wet, in loneliness and constant imminent peril they carry on their indispensable work for the winning of the war, giving their labour and their lives in the hope that when the war is over men will be free as they have never been before. When the war is won they will have earned and earned again the enduring gratitude of all men, and the International Labour Office will have no greater happiness than to be able to play its part in giving to that gratitude concrete expression in securing for seamen a greater measure of safety, comfort and wellbeing than has been their lot in the past.

Montreal, 1 June 1942

E. J. PHELAN,
Acting Director

APPENDIX I

MEMBERSHIP OF THE JOINT MARITIME COMMISSION AS AT 31 DECEMBER 1941

(As resulting from the elections by the employers' and workers' groups at the 21st Session of the International Labour Conference, 1936, and subsequent replacements)

Chairman

The Chairman of the Governing Body

Regular Members

Employers' Group: Mr. OERSTED; substitute, Mr. LECOCQ

Workers' Group: Mr. HALLSWORTH; substitute, Mr. JOUHAUX

Shipowners:

Mr. SNEDDEN (British)	Mr. COSMETTO (Greek)
Mr. LEE (U.S.A.)	Mr. DECKERS (Belgian)
Mr. ODFJELL (Norwegian)	Mr. MACCALLUM (Canadian)
Mr. MARCHEGAY (French)	Mr. VAN DER VORM (Netherlands)
(One seat vacant)	

Seamen:

Mr. BÉCU (Belgian)	Mr. LUNDGREN (Swedish)
Mr. CHAO PAN-FU (Chinese)	Mr. RASMUSSEN (Danish)
Mr. DAHL (Norwegian)	Mr. SCHARRENBURG (U.S.A.)
Mr. EHLERS (French)	Mr. SPENCE (British)
Mr. FIMMEN (Netherlands)	

Deputy Members

Shipowners:

Mr. MAEGAARD (Danish)	Mr. ERULKAR (Indian)
Mr. FILMER (Australian)	

Seamen:

Mr. AFTAB ALI (Indian)	Mr. MARINELLI (Argentine)
Mr. MACDONALD (Canadian)	Mr. TUDEHOPE (Australian)

APPENDIX II

PROGRESS OF RATIFICATION OF MARITIME CONVENTIONS

A.—CONVENTIONS ADOPTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE IN 1936

C. 53. *Officers' competency certificates.*

Came into force 29 March 1939.

Ratifications registered—9: United States of America, Belgium,
Brazil, Denmark, Egypt, Estonia,
Mexico, New Zealand, Norway.

Ratification approved—1: France, 15 June 1939.

“ rejected: Afghanistan, Switzerland, Thailand,
Union of South Africa.

“ adjourned, etc.: China, Iraq, Sweden.

Submitted to competent authority,

with proposal not to ratify: Great Britain, India.

with no proposal: Albania, Australia, Canada, Ireland,
Japan, Lithuania, Netherlands, Portugal.

C. 54. *Holidays with pay (sea).*

Not yet in force; requires ratification by five Members each of
which has more than one million tons gross of sea-going
merchant shipping (Art. 13).

Ratifications registered—2: United States of America, Belgium.¹

Ratification approved—2: France, 15 June 1939; Mexico, 1940.

“ rejected: Afghanistan, Switzerland, Thailand,
Union of South Africa.

“ adjourned, etc.: China, Estonia, Iraq, Sweden.

Submitted to competent authority,

with proposal to adjourn or

reserve ratification: Great Britain, Norway.

with proposal not to ratify: Egypt, India.

¹ This Convention has since been ratified by Mexico.

with no proposal: Albania, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Ireland, Japan, Lithuania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal.

C. 55. Shipowners' liability (sick and injured seamen).

Came into force 29 October 1939.

Ratifications registered—3: United States of America, Belgium, Mexico.

Ratification approved—1: France, 15 June 1939.

“ rejected: Afghanistan, Switzerland, Thailand, Union of South Africa.

“ adjourned, etc.: China, Estonia, Iraq, Sweden.

Submitted to competent authority,

with proposal to adjourn

or reserve ratification: India, Norway.

with proposal not to ratify: Great Britain.

with no proposal: Albania, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Egypt, Ireland, Japan, Lithuania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal.

C. 56. Sickness insurance (sea).

Not yet in force.

Ratifications registered—nil.

Ratification approved—1: Mexico, 29 December 1938.

“ rejected: Afghanistan, Switzerland, Thailand, Union of South Africa.

“ adjourned, etc.: Belgium, China, Estonia, Iraq, Sweden.

Submitted to competent authority,

with proposal to ratify: France, Great Britain.

with proposal to adjourn or

reserve ratification: United States of America, Norway.

with proposal not to ratify: India.

with no proposal: Albania, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Egypt, Ireland, Japan, Lithuania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal.

C. 57. Hours of work and manning (sea).

Not yet in force; requires ratification by five Members each of which has a mercantile marine tonnage of not less than one million tons (Art. 24).

Ratifications registered—4: United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Sweden (conditional on ratification by Denmark, Finland, Great Britain, Netherlands, Norway and U.S.S.R.).

Ratification rejected: Afghanistan, Switzerland, Thailand, Union of South Africa.

“ adjourned, etc.: China, Estonia, Iraq.

Submitted to competent authority,

with proposal to ratify: France.

with proposal to adjourn or

reserve ratification: Norway.

with proposal not to ratify: Egypt, Great Britain, India.

with no proposal: Albania, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Ireland, Japan, Lithuania, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal.

C. 58. Minimum age (sea) (revised).

Came into force 11 April 1939.

Ratifications registered—6: United States of America, Belgium, Brazil, Iraq, Norway, Sweden.

Ratification approved—1: Netherlands.

“ rejected: Afghanistan, Switzerland, Thailand, Union of South Africa.

“ adjourned, etc.: China, Estonia.

Submitted to competent authority,

with proposal to ratify: Great Britain.

with proposal not to ratify: India.

with no proposal: Albania, Australia, Canada, Denmark, Egypt, France, Ireland, Japan, Lithuania, Mexico, New Zealand, Portugal.

B.—CONVENTIONS ADOPTED BY THE CONFERENCE BEFORE 1936

Total number of ratifications and ratifications registered after March 1935

C. 7. Minimum age (sea), 1920. Came into force 27 September 1921.

Ratifications registered—32: Australia, Brazil, Chile, China.

C. 8. Unemployment indemnity (shipwreck), 1920. Came into force 16 March 1923.

Ratifications registered—28: Australia, Chile, Denmark, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway.

C. 9. Placing of seamen, 1920. Came into force 23 November 1921.

Ratifications registered—27: Chile, Denmark, Mexico, New Zealand.

C. 15. Minimum age (trimmers and stokers), 1921. Came into force 20 November 1922.

Ratifications registered—32: Argentina, Australia, Chile, China.

C. 16. Medical examination (young persons) (sea), 1921. Came into force 20 November 1922.

Ratifications registered—33: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Chile, China, Denmark, Mexico.

C. 22. Seamen's articles of agreement, 1926. Came into force 4 April 1928.

Ratifications registered—25: Australia, Canada, Chile, China, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway.

C. 23. Repatriation of seamen, 1926. Came into force 16 April 1928.

Ratifications registered—17: China.

APPENDIX III

RESOLUTIONS (OF MARITIME INTEREST) OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION, NEW YORK—WASHINGTON, 1941

A. Resolutions adopted by the Conference

(1) Resolution on post-war emergency and reconstruction measures.

Whereas the victory of the free peoples in the war against totalitarian aggression is an indispensable condition of the attainment of the ideals of the International Labour Organisation; and

Whereas the close of the war must be followed by immediate action, previously planned and arranged, for the feeding of peoples in need, for the reconstruction of the devastated countries, for the provision and transportation of raw materials and capital equipment necessary for the restoration of economic activity, for the reopening of trade outlets, for the resettlement of workers and their families under circumstances in which they can work in freedom and security and hope, for the changing over of industry to the needs of peace, for the maintenance of employment, and for the raising of standards of living throughout the world; and

Whereas the accomplishment of these purposes will require the "fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field"; and

Whereas such collaboration will set tasks of organisation and administration calling for the highest ability and for the most sympathetic understanding of the needs of peoples; and

Whereas the International Labour Organisation, which possesses the confidence of the free peoples and includes in its structure the representatives of workers and employers, is for these reasons peculiarly fitted to take part in this work in such a way as to minimise misunderstanding and unrest and to promote a stable and enduring peace:

The Conference of the International Labour Organisation

Requests the Governing Body:

- (a) to transmit this resolution forthwith to the Governments of all Member States, to call their attention to the desir-

- ability of associating the International Labour Organisation with the planning and application of measures of reconstruction, and to ask that the International Labour Organisation be represented in any Peace or Reconstruction Conference following the war;
- (b) to suggest to the Governments of the Member States that they should, if they have not already done so, set up representative agencies for the study of the social and economic needs of the post-war world and that such agencies should consult with the appropriate organs of the International Labour Organisation;
 - (c) to set up from its own membership a small tripartite committee, instructed to study and prepare (i) measures of reconstruction, and (ii) measures to deal with unemployment, which should be empowered to enlist the assistance of technically qualified experts and authorised to co-operate with governmental, intergovernmental and private agencies engaged in similar studies and with those agencies whose present activities in the social and economic field affect the conditions under which post-war programmes will be carried out;
 - (d) to make full use of such existing organs of the International Labour Organisation as the International Public Works Committee, the Permanent Agricultural Committee, the Permanent Committee on Migration for Settlement, and the Joint Maritime Commission, and from time to time to make such modifications in the composition of these agencies, and to set up such new agencies, as may be needed to meet the responsibilities implied in this resolution;
 - (e) to direct the programme of work of the International Labour Office to fulfil the purposes of this resolution; and
 - (f) to report on the subject matter of this resolution to the next and subsequent meetings of the International Labour Conference so that the International Labour Organisation shall be in a position to give authoritative expression to the social objectives confided to it, in the rebuilding of a peaceful world upon the basis of "improved labour standards, economic advancement and social security".

(2) *Resolution endorsing the Atlantic Charter.*

Whereas by the Atlantic Charter the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom have announced eight common principles in the national policies

of their respective Governments on which they base their hopes for the better future of the world; and

Whereas these principles have been approved by all the Allied Governments; and

Whereas the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth of these principles are as follows:

Fourth, they will endeavour, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing for all improved labour standards, economic advancement and social security.

Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

and

Whereas the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation proclaims that a lasting peace "can be established only if it is based on social justice":

The Conference of the International Labour Organisation endorses the aforementioned principles of the Atlantic Charter, requests that the fullest use be made of the machinery and experience of the International Labour Organisation in giving effect to these principles, and pledges the full co-operation of the International Labour Organisation in their implementation.

(3) Resolution on the war and peace.

The Conference of the International Labour Organisation, meeting in New York from 27 October to 5 November and attended by delegates from forty nations,

Having received the reports of the representatives from the countries occupied by the Axis armies,

Notes that in all the countries occupied by these armies freedom of association has been suppressed, as well as all other democratic rights and liberties;

Expresses its deepest sympathy with the millions of human beings in China, Great Britain, Russia and on the continent of Europe on whom the Axis war machine has inflicted indescribable

sufferings and who are living at the present time in the most acute moral and material distress.

The Conference solemnly declares that it is only the victory of free nations the world over, who are fighting for democracy and for the maintenance of the inalienable rights of man, which can save the world from hopeless chaos.

The Conference expresses its warmest admiration and profound gratitude to the brave peoples who are fighting against the most savage barbarians that history has ever known, and thus saving mankind from complete defeat; by their heroic resistance these free men and women have not only saved the world from defeat but have also laid the foundations for the victory of democracy which can alone guarantee social progress and freedom.

The Conference urges all free peoples to contribute to the uttermost limit of their power for the victory of China, Great Britain, Russia and their Allies by supplying all the arms which their industry can produce.

The Conference insists that, after having made sure of victory, the most important task for the democracies will be to establish the principles of economic co-operation which should be laid down between all the nations of the world; it is important that a start should be made immediately with the study of the economic conditions which will make social progress possible, so that, when victory has been won, the free nations will be ready to face the great task of reconstruction in order that the blessings of peace on earth and goodwill among men may become real and universal.

(5) Resolution on collaboration between Governments, workers and employers in the planning and application of public policies.

Whereas workers and employers of any country are so vital to the production and general mobilisation and defence effort of any nation; and

Whereas wisdom and justice both dictate that the workers and employers of each country should by virtue of their importance to these efforts be accorded a voice in the determination of their economic and social interests:

The Conference recommends that in agencies set up by public authority which include among their functions the planning and application of public policies which directly or indirectly affect the interest of workers and employers, the policy-making and administrative agencies should include representatives and responsible spokesmen of workers and employers acting jointly with their Governments.

*B. Resolution referred by the Conference to the Governing Body of
the International Labour Office for Consideration*

Resolution concerning creation of merchant navies, submitted by Mr. Fernández R., Workers' delegate, Cuba; Mr. Ibáñez Aguila, Workers' delegate, Chile; Mr. Hurtado, Workers' delegate, Mexico; and Mr. Rodríguez Aneiros, Workers' delegate, Uruguay.

Whereas commercial relations between countries have been hampered because of difficulties due to the war and because of the shortage of shipping and the difficulties of maritime transport;

Whereas the volume of imports and exports between the countries of America has suffered from the repercussions of this abnormal situation owing to the insufficiency of the merchant marines of those countries;

Whereas at the recent Pan-American Conferences and Conferences of Ministers of Foreign Affairs special attention has been paid to the necessity for improving and extending maritime transport between the countries of this continent:

The Conference recommends that the necessary measures be taken by the nations concerned with a view to the creation of a merchant navy in each of them, in order to facilitate trade and to provide employment for new groups of workers under the conditions laid down by the Conventions of the International Labour Organisation dealing with work on board ship and with work in ports.

PART II

Attendance at the Session

CHAIRMAN

Sir Frederick W. LEGGETT, C.B., Deputy Secretary of the Ministry of Labour and National Service, Representative of the British Government on the Governing Body of the International Labour Office (acting for Professor Carter GOODRICH, Chairman of the Governing Body).

REGULAR MEMBERS

<i>Employers' Group:</i> Sir John FORBES WATSON	} (appointed by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office).
<i>Workers' Group:</i> Mr. Joseph HALLSWORTH	

Shipowners:

Mr. Richard SNEDDEN, General Manager, Shipping Federation of Great Britain.

Commander Robert C. LEE, Executive Vice-President, Moore-McCormack Lines, United States of America.

Mr. David S. ERULKAR, Indian National Steamship Owners' Association.

Mr. William DAHL-HANSEN, former Vice-President, Norwegian Shipowners' Association; Norwegian Shipping and Trade Mission.

Mr. Percy A. CLEWS, Shipping Federation of Canada.

Mr. Dirk HUDIG, Netherlands Shipping and Trade Committee.

Mr. Constantine J. LYRAS, Greek Shipping Co-operation Committee.

Mr. Albert P. STEER, Manager, Compagnie Maritime Belge.

Mr. A. V. J. Pierre de MALGLAIVE, Free French Mercantile Marine.

Seamen:

Mr. Omer BÉCU, General Secretary, Belgian Mercantile Marine Officers' Association.

- Mr. CHU HSUEH-FAN, Chinese Association of Labour.
 Mr. Joseph CURRAN, President, National Maritime Union of America.
 Mr. Ingvald HAUGEN, President, Norwegian Seamen's Union.
 Mr. Charles JARMAN, General Secretary, National Union of Seamen (Great Britain).
 Mr. Sven J. LUNDGREN, General Secretary, Swedish Seamen's Union.
 Mr. Anders G. F. SOERE, Swedish Engineer Officers' Association.
 Mr. James A. TUDEHOPE, Secretary, Maritime Transport Council (Employees) of Australia.
 Mr. Morris WEISBERGER, Vice-President, Seafarers' International Union of North America.

DEPUTY MEMBERS

Shipowners:

- Mr. Charles B. L. FILMER, Australian Steamship Owners' Federation.
 Mr. Witold JASINSKI, Polish Shipowners' Association.
 Mr. Vladimir RADONICICH, Yugoslav Shipping Committee.

Seamen:

- Captain William H. COOMBS, General Secretary, Navigators and Engineer Officers' Union (of Great Britain); President, International Mercantile Marine Officers' Association.
 Mr. Jacobus H. OLDENBROEK, President, Contact Committee, Netherlands Officers' and Seamen's Unions.
 Mr. Alojzy ADAMCZYK, President, Polish Union of Seamen (Z.Z.J.).
 Mr. Surat ALLEY, Representative, All-India Seamen's Federation.
 Mr. Louis P. F. DROGUET, International Mercantile Marine Officers' Association.

SUBSTITUTES, ADVISERS AND ASSISTANTS ACCOMPANYING THE SHIPOWNERS' REPRESENTATIVES

- Mr. H. W. GREANY, Secretary, Shipping Federation.
 Mr. Colin S. ANDERSON, Chairman, Technical Committee on Safety of Life at Sea, Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom.
 Mr. A. F. G. AYLING, Departmental Manager (Marine), Anglo-Saxon Petroleum Company, Ltd.

Mr. B. R. HUMPHREYS, Departmental Manager, Gray Dawes & Co.

Miss Emily J. KELL, Chief Executive Assistant, Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom.

Captain Robert LIDDLE, British India Steam Navigation Co.

Captain Martin WORSOE, Manager, Marine Department, Norwegian Shipping and Trade Mission.

Mr. OLYSLAGER, Netherlands Shipping and Trade Committee.

Mr. D. RAHUSEN " " " "

Mr. L. BOHLKEN " " " "

Mr. A. BERNARIS, Secretary, Greek Shipping Co-operation Committee.

Mr. M. E. LENTAKIS, Greek Shipping Co-operation Committee.

Captain J. FAFOUTAKIS, Greek Merchant Navy.

Mr. Paul P. VEREECKE, Manager, Compagnie Maritime Belge.

Mr. Georges DUFOUR, Compagnie Maritime Belge.

Captain L. DEBURGES, Marine Superintendent, Agence Maritime Internationale.

Captain Charles GUÉNA, Free French Forces.

Mr. I. IVANOVIC, Yugoslav Shipping Committee.

SUBSTITUTES, ADVISERS AND ASSISTANTS ACCOMPANYING THE SEAMEN'S REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. J. JANSSENS, Assistant Secretary, Belgian Mercantile Marine Officers' Association.

Mr. P. de WITTE, Belgian Seamen's Union.

Mr. CHANGSIAOTONG, Chinese Seamen's Union in Great Britain.

Mr. CHEN TAH WEI " " " " "

Mr. CHEUNG KWAI " " " " "

Mr. Albert DUNCHOW " " " " "

Mr. LING CHING CHUNG " " " " "

Mr. James B. GRISS, National Maritime Union of America.

Mr. T. ERICHSEN, Norwegian Navigating Officers' Union.

Mr. Andreas LÖVGREN, General Secretary, Norwegian Engineer Officers' Union.

Mr. Thos. SÖNSTEBY, Norwegian Seamen's Union.

Mr. P. R. BALDOCK, National Union of Seamen.

Mr. L. N. BOWDEN " " "

Mr. S. W. JAMES " " "

Mr. John PRICE, Transport and General Workers' Union.

Mr. N. H. AAKESSON, Swedish Maritime Officers' Union.

Mr. D. S. TENNANT, Assistant to General Manager, Officers' Federation.

Mr. J. MENTINK, Netherlands Officers' Federation.
 Mr. J. DABKOWSKI, Association of Polish Captains, Navigating,
 Engineer and Radio Officers.
 Mr. Leon PASSALSKI, Secretary, Polish Union of Seamen.
 Mr. H. M. GUÉRIN, French Trade Union Centre.
 Mr. Dragotin DOMAC, Yugoslav Merchant Navy.
 Mr. K. A. PERTHO, Danish Officers' Union.

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

Sir Frederick LEGGETT, Chairman of the Commission.

Mr. HUDIG	}	Shipowners' Members.
Mr. LEE		
Mr. SNEDDEN		

Mr. BÉCU	}	Seamen's Members.
Mr. COOMBS		
Mr. HAUGEN		

GROUP OFFICERS

Shipowners' Group — Chairman: Mr. SNEDDEN.
 Secretary: Mr. GREANY.

Seamen's Group — Chairman: Mr. JARMAN.
 Secretary: Mr. OLDENBROEK.

SECRETARIAT

Mr. M. R. K. BURGE, Director of the London Office, I.L.O.
 Mr. C. W. H. WEAVER, Chief of the Central Section, represent-
 ing the Acting Director of the I.L.O.
 Mr. C. W. JENKS, Legal Adviser, I.L.O.
 Mr. R. J. P. MORTISHED, Maritime Service, I.L.O.

PART III

Resolutions Adopted

RATIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONVENTIONS

In view of the fact that a number of important Conventions on maritime questions adopted by the International Labour Organisation have so far not been ratified by various Member Governments, including those of important maritime countries,

And in view of the special urgency of measures to promote the safety and wellbeing of seafarers,

The Joint Maritime Commission urges Governments to ratify as soon as possible those Conventions which present no substantial difficulties and to institute immediately national consultations between the Governments and the organisations of shipowners and seafarers on the other Conventions to see whether the essential principles of those Conventions are capable of early application and whether the obstacles to ratification can be overcome.

SAFETY MEASURES FOR SEAMEN

I

The Joint Maritime Commission,

Having examined the measures now in force in a number of countries for the protection of seamen against the dangers to which they are exposed in time of war, and having noted with satisfaction the great progress made as a result of the war in devising effective safety measures,

Expresses its conviction that the paramount consideration should in all cases be the safety of the seamen and that considerations of expense should not be allowed to be a barrier to the adoption of the most effective measures of protection.

The Commission further considers that every effort should be made to secure the adoption by all maritime countries of the safety measures which experience has shown to be practicable and effective.

The Commission requests the International Labour Office:

- (a) to communicate to Governments as soon as possible, on the basis of the existing practice in the countries having the widest experience in this matter and of the suggestions for further improvements set out in the Appendix to this Resolution, which have been approved by the Commission, a summary statement of the life-saving measures best calculated to protect merchant seamen in time of war, and to urge them to review and revise their existing regulations on the matter in the light of the information thus given in order that a high and reasonably uniform standard of safety may be ensured for all seamen;
- (b) to continue its study of the question of measures for the protection of seamen in case of shipwreck, fire and other perils in order that the requisite information may be available and unnecessary delay be avoided when conditions permit consideration of the possibility of adopting an international labour Convention on safety measures for seamen;
- (c) to recommend Governments to consider entering into reciprocal arrangements under which a national authority will be authorised to carry out, on its own initiative or on the representations of the crew concerned, inspection of the safety equipment of a ship of foreign registration lying in a port within the jurisdiction of that authority and to issue an international certificate of inspection.

Appendix

(1) On vessels of not less than 3,000 tons gross the lifeboats provided should include one motor lifeboat on each side, adequately provided with fuel.

(2) The use of the radial type of davit should be discontinued at the earliest practicable opportunity and all new tonnage should be fitted with davits mechanically operated for the purpose of swinging lifeboats outboard.

(3) On new vessels pumps, particularly main and circulating pumps, which discharge above the light load line should be fitted with remote control valves for shutting them down. These controls should be located near to the remote control for the main engines. The same arrangements should be applied to existing ships as and when practicable.

(4) On tankers carrying inflammables all lifeboats should be of steel and some life-rafts should be carried aft in the ship.

(5) Expeditious investigation should be made into the design of the best hull form and weather protection for lifeboats.

(6) Nails should not be used in the construction of wooden life-rafts.

(7) Expert consideration should be given to the advisability of equipping lifeboats with radio transmission sets capable of transmitting on short wave lengths as well as on 600 metres.

(8) Definite and adequate arrangements should be made for the position of an abandoned ship to be communicated to those in charge of boats.

(9) Every lifeboat should carry a waterproof chart, or alternatively a chart in a waterproof container, for use in the vicinity in which the ship is sailing.

(10) Adequate visibility of the lifeboat compass should be ensured by the use of luminous compass-cards or by effective illumination.

(11) Every lifeboat should be provided with signal pistol equipment.

(12) The greatest possible use should be made of the space available in lifeboats for the carriage of water and every care should be taken to see that the water supplies are replenished when necessary.

(13) Buoyant containers with supplies of fresh water should be carried on board ship in close proximity to the lifeboats and so arranged that they will readily float free of the ship.

(14) Every lifeboat should be provided with a unit type first-aid kit in a weather-tight metal container.

(15) Before a vessel leaves its first port of departure fire and boat drills should be held and all life-saving appliances should be inspected. Drills should also be held before leaving any port at which any important change has been made in the crew. Every drill and inspection should be entered in the log book.

II

The Joint Maritime Commission agrees that it is important in wartime in the interests of safety that officers and ratings should where practicable have reasonable rest before going on watch prior to sailing.

III

Having agreed to many improvements to the existing standard and methods employed in the saving of life at sea and in view of the urgency of their immediate application, members of this Joint Maritime Commission further pledge themselves that they will immediately do all in their power to ensure that such decisions become operative at the earliest possible date.

ORGANISATION FOR SEAMEN'S WELFARE

The Joint Maritime Commission,

Having noted with satisfaction the measures taken by a certain number of Governments to make provision, in accordance with the Recommendation of the International Labour Conference in 1936, for the welfare of seafarers of their own and other countries while ashore,

Considers nevertheless that, especially in war conditions, it

is urgently necessary that such provision should be made on an adequate scale in all maritime countries and should be systematically organised in such a way as to ensure the continuance of necessary welfare schemes after the war.

The Commission therefore urges all maritime Members of the International Labour Organisation to give effect without delay to the provisions of the Seamen's Welfare in Ports Recommendation, 1936.

The Commission calls the attention of Governments in particular to the following matters which it considers to be of special importance:

- (1) The administration of welfare schemes should be so organised as to give effective control to representatives of industrial organisations directly concerned with ships and the sea.
- (2) The financing of such schemes should be organised on an adequate and permanent basis and should not be exclusively dependent upon so-called charitable organisations.
- (3) Special provision should be made without delay for visiting seamen on the basis of equality of treatment irrespective of colour, race or religion.
- (4) Medical research services should be organised as soon as practicable for the scientific investigation of questions relating to the promotion and maintenance of the health of seamen afloat.

EQUALITY OF TREATMENT OF SEAFARERS

The members of this Joint Maritime Commission record their admiration of the war effort of Chinese, Indian and all other seamen from Asia, Africa and the East and West Indies serving in the fleets of the United Nations.

They urge that in collaboration with the respective organisations and Governments concerned all practicable steps should be taken to ensure that in the conditions of employment and general treatment of these seamen there shall be no unfavourable comparison with crews of vessels in similar trades and under the same registry.

THE SHIPPING INDUSTRY AND THE PEACE CONFERENCE

The Joint Maritime Commission strongly urges that the shipping industry as a whole, both shipowners and seafarers, should be represented at the Peace Conference and any preparations for it or for carrying out the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

INTERNATIONAL MARITIME CHARTER

The Joint Maritime Commission invites the International Labour Office to study whether it is practicable to prepare an International Maritime Charter setting out guiding principles for an international minimum standard applicable to seafarers of all nationalities, embodying the best practicable social legislation affecting seafarers.

CONDITIONS OF SERVICE OF SEAFARERS

This meeting of the Joint Maritime Commission invites the International Labour Office to prepare for submission to the next meeting of the Commission a statement on the present position, specifying the wartime changes, concerning the conditions of service of seafarers of the principal maritime nations, with special reference to hours of work at sea and ashore, manning, holidays with pay, security of employment, accommodation, pensions, training, and recruitment.

ORGANISATION OF MERCHANT FLEETS

This meeting of the Joint Maritime Commission invites the International Labour Office to prepare for submission to a future meeting of the Commission a statement on the measures taken by the principal maritime nations to adapt the organisation, control and operation of their respective merchant fleets to wartime conditions.

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS ON THE UTILISATION OF MERCHANT SHIPPING

This meeting of the Joint Maritime Commission invites the International Labour Office to prepare for submission to a future meeting of the Commission a statement of any public information available on the international agreements or arrangements made between the principal maritime nations with a view to securing the most effective use of merchant shipping in wartime.

PART IV

Record of Proceedings

Opening of the Session

First Sitting, 26 June 1942

The CHAIRMAN: In the first place I have to express my regret, which I am sure is shared by all the members of the Commission, that Mr. Carter Goodrich, the Chairman of the Governing Body, has been unable to come here to attend this important meeting. It is for me a very great honour to have the privilege of presiding over this session, the first since the commencement of the war, of this important maritime body at this time.

It is a very long time since the last session of this Commission was held, in 1935 in Paris. Since that time a very great deal has happened to the International Labour Organisation, and I think we owe it to the wonderful efforts of the late Director, Mr. Winant, now the distinguished Ambassador of his country to this country, and to the members of the staff of the Office, and particularly Mr. Phelan, and to the kindness of the Canadian Government and of McGill University, that the Office has become established in Canada and has been able to undertake and build up again the work of this important international organisation.

The Acting Director, in his Report, recounts the various activities of these past years, but I should like to mention one of them which all of us who were present will ever remember, and that is the Conference in New York in November last, which ended at the White House in Washington with so inspiring and hopeful a speech by the President of the United States. All of us who played a part in the stimulating and hospitable atmosphere of New York felt, I think, that the activities of this Organisation had received a new start as a result of that Conference.

There have been great difficulties in arranging this meeting, and I think we should pay a tribute to those members of the Office, small now in number, who have prepared the documents and made the arrangements. It has been a little unfortunate, perhaps, that owing to the difficulties of travel—and it is wonderful to think

of what distances some of you have come to attend this meeting—it was uncertain when this meeting would begin. Certain arrangements had been made for the opening of the session, in order to welcome you to this country, but it has been necessary, owing to other important matters, to change those arrangements; but I should like to say at once that the members of the Government here who have a special interest in our work will take an early opportunity of meeting you in circumstances which will enable that welcome to be given and contacts to be established. My own Minister looks forward, I know, to that time.

This meeting is a very representative one. The Merchant Marines of twelve countries are represented, either by shipowners' or seamen's representatives or both, and some of them are the far distant countries of the world. I think that the efforts which have been made to attend by some of those who have come here are worthy of the important place which this Organisation holds in regard to seamen throughout the world.

We are at the present time—and here I speak for this country, at any rate—learning a great many lessons about the value of the services of various classes of the community. One of the few good things about this war is that it has taught everybody more about those services which are so often hidden from the ordinary eye, but upon which the whole life of the community depends; and it is not, perhaps, a matter for surprise that those who have come to the front and who occupy so much attention to-day are the very ones who have tended to be forgotten in the past.

We hope, and I can say that in this country we believe, that, now that that has been fully appreciated, all that has been done during the war to improve conditions will not be departed from, but that we shall be able to build further upon what has been done.

The advantage of such a body as this is that we have both employers and employees present, and so we can be quite sure that what is done will be done in the light of practical considerations. I think that I speak for the responsible organisations in this country when I say that they have no desire merely to take advantage of present circumstances to secure improvements which may be only passing improvements; they really wish to build on a sound basis, so that there will be a progressive development, and not the up-and-down swing which has caused so much misfortune and so much unhappiness in the past. I think that the chief value of bodies such as this is that they are bodies of practical people, and I feel sure that any conclusions which come from this Commission will be practical conclusions, and not merely based on sentiment or on theoretical considerations.

I ought not to take up more time now in saying anything about the future work of the Commission, but there is one thing that I should like to suggest. I feel that the debt which is owed by humanity to seamen can never be repaid. Upon them at this moment depends largely our ability to hold together until the time comes when we may expect to submerge the forces which are now playing such an evil part in the world. In the course of the last three years enormous sacrifices have been made by the men whom you represent, and I feel that it would be fitting if, at the commencement of this first international meeting of employers' and seamen's representatives, we should stand for a few moments in silence, in remembrance of those who have given their lives for humanity.

The delegates stood in silence for a short time.

Mr. BURGE: It falls to me, as the representative of the Office in London and with the Allied Governments now established here, to convey to the Commission the apologies of the Acting Director, Mr. Phelan, for his absence. He deeply regrets that difficulties of transatlantic communication, together with a succession of urgent engagements at which his own attendance is essential, prevent him from being here. He has sent as his personal representative the senior British official on the staff in Montreal, Mr. Weaver, who will be in attendance throughout the session.

Mr. Phelan sends his cordial greetings to his old friends on the Commission, and to those who are taking part in this work for the first time. He assures them of his keen interest in their deliberations, and sends his best wishes for the success of the meeting. He is well aware that the maritime industry has always been an essential link between the nations, and that to-day it is the very life-line between the free peoples, and that free men everywhere owe an immense debt to the seamen by whose heroism that life-line is maintained, with a disregard of danger and discomfort which is beyond all praise.

He sincerely hopes that the present meeting, by seeking solutions in the spirit of free collaboration for the problems immediately arising out of the war situation, may usefully aid the effort of the United Nations, and that, by giving yet another example of the success of the I.L.O. democratic method, it may strengthen the foundations of the better world to be built after the war, a world in which the seamen can secure their share of the fruits of the victory to which they are so essentially contributing.

To that message from the Acting Director, I should like to add my personal greetings to the Commission. I should also like to take this opportunity to inform you that the premises in which we

are meeting and their furnishings have been generously supplied by the British Government. Without that help, which is all the more appreciated because Governments are not directly represented on the Commission, it would have been very difficult for this meeting to be organised. The Office will, of course, express its thanks to the authorities in the appropriate way, but I thought it was proper that the Commission should be aware of that fact at the outset of its work.

Report of the Acting Director

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Sixth Sitting, 29 June 1942

Mr. OLDENBROEK: We are grateful to the International Labour Office, and to the Governing Body in particular, for convening this meeting. It was the desire of the seamen's organisations that the work of the International Labour Office and of the Joint Maritime Commission in particular should continue even during wartime, and we are pleased to find that the International Labour Organisation has realised that necessity.

In the concluding pages of his Report, the Acting Director pays tribute to the work which is being done by the seamen. This Commission has already had an opportunity of associating itself with those words. I should also like to draw the attention of the Commission to the work that the seamen's organisations have done in order to make it possible to take that great part in the war effort that the seamen and the officers are taking; because we, as international organisations of officers and men, have been able to rally the support not only of the seamen of the United Nations, which is only natural, but even of the seamen of many other countries which today are neutral or semi-neutral, or even opposed to our cause. I refer to the Danes; we have Danish representatives here. I refer to the Finns; they have no representatives here, but we know that hundreds and hundreds of Finnish seamen are sailing in our ships and are continuing to do so, because they have been appealed to by our international organisations. The same applies to the seamen of that neutral seafaring country, Sweden. That country is neutral, but its seamen stand entirely on our side, and thousands find themselves outside their country in the same position as the seamen of many Allied countries—Belgium, Holland, Norway, Greece and Yugoslavia—who cannot return to their countries. The Swedish seamen could return to their country, but they will not do so, because they want to support us in our fight.

I want, on behalf of these organisations, to make the statement that we desire that freedom of association shall be maintained in all our countries, and that the seamen's organisations and the officers' organisations shall remain independent bodies, independent of any Government or outside control. That is perhaps one of the principles of the International Labour Organisation; I say "perhaps" because we have found in the past that that principle, for reasons into which I shall not go, has not been appreciated and realised; and therefore I make this definite statement.

We have shown that that is our intention, even in this time of war, because we have not been prepared to recognise organisations of Greek and Yugoslav seamen until the Governments of those countries gave us a pledge that their semi-fascist state of trade union organisation would be ended, and that in future these workers will have the free right of association as we know it in the democratic countries.

Some of our organisations have made the definite declaration that during this time of war they will not enter into any strike. Other unions have not done so; but in effect the result is the same, because we all realise that this war must be won, and that for that reason upheavals and unrest must be avoided as much as possible.

It was the International Labour Conference of 1941 which passed a resolution requesting the Governing Body to call a meeting of this Commission. We can see the importance of this meeting in the light of the decisions reached at the International Labour Conference of 1941, and we representatives of the seafarers say that this international organisation must start a new page, if not a new chapter, in its history. One chapter ended in 1939; in 1941, the International Labour Conference held in New York was the beginning of a new chapter, because everyone who had the opportunity of taking part in or taking note of the decisions of that Conference will realise and admit that there was a general desire to expand the scope of the International Labour Organisation. Perhaps in some quarters that decision was taken reluctantly, but the decisions of the Conference are there to show that that was the desire of an overwhelming majority, so overwhelming that those who were not inclined readily to agree did not think it wise to express another view or not to agree with the decisions taken at that Conference.

Now what, in reality, was the very important step which that International Labour Conference took? It expressed the view that it was necessary for the International Labour Organisation in future to deal not only with social questions but also with economic questions. We have been faced with great difficulties in the past when it has been pointed out to us that considerations of an econo-

mic character made it impossible for the International Labour Organisation to do this or that. I think that that was partly the reason for I will not say the lack of success but the limited scope of the Organisation and the limited possibilities of success. That will have to be changed in the future, and it is possible to change it because of the decisions taken in 1941.

What applies to the International Labour Organisation in general—of which we are only a small, although I admit an important, part—will also have to apply to us; and, in order to make that development possible, in order to give the seamen the chance of making the first efforts in that direction, we requested and urged the calling of a conference, notwithstanding the fact that we are at war. We do not think that the war effort will thereby be impeded; on the contrary, we think that it will be in the interests of the war effort that this should go on, and that we should proclaim what we are fighting for and what we are going to do in the future.

It should be clear to everybody that the seamen have little reason to be satisfied with the work of this Joint Maritime Commission so far. I do not go into details, because other friends of mine will deal with the separate chapters in the Report of the Acting Director, relating to things which were undertaken but which have not been carried out successfully. With regard to hours, for instance, it took the I.L.O. not less than 17 years to draw up a Convention on hours and manning for seamen. We felt that it was only, perhaps, in the face of a new war coming along that a number of Governments and shipowners were prepared to go that far. But we have not gone very much further yet.

When I say that this body must follow the lead given by the International Labour Conference, I think that that means that we must not restrict ourselves to social questions, but must also deal with economic problems. There are for the shipping industry tremendous problems ahead in which the seamen are just as much interested as the shipowners. The ownership really does not arise for us; the question is, what services is the shipping industry going to render in the post-war period? We know that there are difficulties ahead so far as the transport of goods generally is concerned, international difficulties not limited to shipping but affecting all means of transport. There will be difficulties in carrying out that task and there will be difficulties so far as the allocation of the part in that great effort which is to be given to the different countries is concerned. We are convinced that in that respect the workers of the sea have to make their contribution, and a great contribution, of which they are aware; and they think that it will even be possible for them to bring their influence to bear, and that they will succeed

sooner than others in bringing about a united view, because they have no conflicting interests. It is our hope, therefore, that you will agree that the I.L.O. should forthwith deal also with these problems, concerning which we have tabled a number of resolutions.

I want to finish by saying that we desire to support the work of the International Labour Organisation to the utmost limit. We are out to win the war, but we do also want this body to realise its responsibilities and its duties and its obligations towards the seamen. We are not satisfied with what has been achieved so far; you will see that from our resolutions. We hope that everybody in this room will understand what these responsibilities are, and that they must be met; because we cannot go back to 1939. We started again in 1941, and we must go forward and achieve our end. We do not want to demand the impossible, but we do not want either to go away without having achieved what is possible.

Mr. SNEDDEN: At this stage, all that I should like to say on behalf of the shipowners is that we too welcome the Report of the Acting Director. It must have been difficult to write such a Report in present circumstances, but it is specially valuable because many of us are new to these meetings, and many of us do not know a great deal about the history either of the I.L.O. or of the Joint Maritime Commission. The Report is particularly clear as to the special procedure which the I.L.O. has adopted not as a matter of charity or philanthropy but as a matter of self-defence in maritime questions.

With regard to the question of freedom of association, which Mr. Oldenbroek has raised, we unreservedly support what he has said. The I.L.O. Constitution lays down that there must be freedom of association both for employers and for workers. We have had any amount of debates on this subject at the I.L.O., and as far as any rate as the free countries are concerned we have always supported that point of view. That will be the unanimous view of this Commission, and, I think, the unanimous view of any body of decent citizens. I should like to say, on this question of having organisations free from Government control, that we hope that that will be applied equally to the shipowners' organisations.

Mr. Oldenbroek has said—and I do not propose to follow him very deeply in the argument at this stage—that his group is not satisfied with the progress of the work of the I.L.O. on maritime questions, or with the work of the Joint Maritime Commission. I do not think that the workers' group in the land Conference is satisfied with the progress made, and therefore they are in just the

same position as the land workers; and I shall at a later stage try to show that on maritime questions we have gone a good deal further than the land Conferences. I think that one of the reasons for that is the fact that we have this Joint Maritime Commission, and that we are able to get together as two groups, without the intervention of a third. The intervention of a third group—I shall develop this later—will not necessarily have the effect of bringing us closer together. Very often our experience in this country is that its effect is to push the two groups apart or aside rather than to bring them together. . .

Ninth Sitting, 30 June 1942

The Commission took formal note of the Report and expressed its thanks to the Acting Director for preparing the Report and other documents for the Commission at a time of great pressure and in a manner very satisfactory to the Commission.

RATIFICATION OF CONVENTIONS

Sixth Sitting, 29 June 1942

Mr. JARMAN: On behalf of the seamen's group, I wish to state that although we are able to note a measure of progress in the number of ratifications of Maritime Conventions registered, we are nevertheless dissatisfied with the results achieved. This applies in particular to the Conventions adopted by the session of the Conference in 1936. It is of course appreciated that conditions after 1936 have been singularly unfavourable to the application of fresh maritime labour legislation; but we do think that, in view of the urgency of certain problems affecting seamen—for example, the question of hours and manning, with which the Convention of 1936 was designed to deal—the Governments should have shown a greater readiness to act in fulfilment of the requirements of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation. For this reason, we ask the representative of the Acting Director on this Commission to draw the attention of all Governments to this considered view of the seamen, and to ascertain whether steps can be taken forthwith to discharge this part of the debt due to the seafaring community for maintaining the economic life of the Free Nations under present wartime conditions.

We suggest that one thing which the Governments must do is to break away from the deadlock of the pre-war period, namely, only to proceed with ratification of an international Convention after the measure has been fought for and translated into the national legislation of a Member country. If ratification is to mean

anything to the seamen, it must show substantial progress on existing practices.

I must therefore ask whether the Office is able to assist us in drawing the attention of the Governments to their undoubted responsibilities towards the seamen.

Mr. KNIGHT: I beg to move the following resolution:

In view of the fact that a number of important Conventions on maritime questions adopted by the International Labour Organisation have so far not been ratified by various Member Governments, including those of important maritime countries,

And in view of the special urgency of measures to promote the safety and wellbeing of seafarers,

The Joint Maritime Commission calls upon the Governments concerned to bring about ratification of the Conventions in question with the least possible delay.

I move that resolution in the hope that our friends on the other side will assist us in bringing about these ratifications. If you glance at page 55 of the Office publication, *The International Seamen's Code*, I think that you will realise the need for a resolution of this kind so far as Great Britain is concerned for, out of 15 Conventions, Great Britain has ratified only 6.

The particular Convention about which I want to speak is that concerned with hours and manning. The seamen's group is unanimous in holding that we cannot let this opportunity pass without pleading for the implementation of all the nice things that are being said about seamen at this juncture and about our contribution towards the destruction of Fascism. It cannot be beyond the bounds of accomplishment that men of experience on our side and on the other side should bring pressure to bear upon the various Governments to ratify a Convention which was agreed upon seven years ago.

It is no use thinking that you can promise something to seamen and then expect them to be satisfied with that promise and nothing more. As an official of the National Union of Seamen of Great Britain, I can say that when we talk to our men in reply to their questions about what is happening we have to admit that we are not able to say that we are satisfied with the slow progress which is being made after Conventions have been adopted. There is no reason at all why nationally we should not implement the promises made to our men, especially in view of the services that they are contributing to the whole of the free peoples of the world.

We have agreed to the principle of 56 hours in Britain, but there is a clause in the agreement which says that the men engaged

in the deck department may be called upon to work eight extra hours. That has led to a great deal of trouble in many ports, because there are some officers who interpret that "may" as "shall", and we have many disputes from that cause.

We feel, therefore, that the time has come when this Convention on hours should be ratified, so that when a man has completed a certain number of hours in a given number of days he should know exactly what he is entitled to, without there being any disputes or even references to boards of negotiation.

On the question of manning, I admit that we in Britain have made considerable progress so far as the deck department is concerned, but so far as the stokehold department is concerned we are faced with the position that new ships are built without any consideration being given to the question of the number of men who are to man the ship. Often the experiment is tried of seeing what is the minimum number which can be utilised in that ship, which again causes discontent among our membership. We feel that at all times the trade union representatives should be consulted and taken into confidence at conferences, so that we are able to participate in decisions regarding the manning of ships based upon our practical knowledge of the difficulties which will confront our men in their daily toil.

There is no need for me to tell the Commission that when a man goes to sea he leaves his home and loved ones behind, with the result that not only is the ship his place of work but also his place of abode, and therefore he should have congenial conditions both in his employment and in his living quarters. I want to express the opinion of the seamen's group that we should not hesitate, if the Governments are slow in ratification, to carry out the Convention nationally, and show even the Governments up because of their slowness.

I shall conclude by expressing the hope that this resolution will be unanimously adopted. I appeal to those whose Governments have shown themselves to be slow to ratify to try to do something to settle these problems more rapidly, so that we shall be able to do away with the dissatisfaction which most certainly exists to-day.

Mr. LUNDGREN: It is of the greatest importance that the Conventions which have been adopted should be ratified, because otherwise there is not much utility in this Commission and in the Maritime Conference, if the Conventions which are elaborated and adopted are never put into force.

Since the outbreak of the war, the importance of the work of seamen has been realised much more than ever before. If seamen are to improve their conditions the social legislation affecting them

must be improved, and in that respect seamen are much behind other bodies of workers. The Convention on hours and manning has been adopted by the International Labour Conference, but it has not been ratified by many countries, and Sweden is one of those which have not ratified it.

It is of the utmost importance, from the point of view of improving the standards of seamen, that their quarters on board ship should be improved. Seamen are away from home most of the time, and it is therefore of the greatest importance that they should have proper living quarters.

Among other Conventions which have been adopted but which have not been ratified by all countries is that dealing with the placing of seamen. This very important Convention has not been ratified by India. It is very unfortunate that in certain countries the placing of seamen is still being carried out by private institutions, as in the case of China.

Mr. WEAVER: I intervene only for a moment to reply to Mr. Jarman, who asked me, as the representative of the Acting Director, to convey to the Acting Director the seamen's desire that the I.L.O. should do everything in its power to secure the ratification of the Maritime Conventions.

It has always been the policy of the International Labour Office, within the limits of its competence, to do everything it can to secure the ratification and effective application of Conventions adopted by the Conference, and I shall certainly convey to the Acting Director Mr. Jarman's remarks on this point. The proceedings of this Commission will, of course, in the normal course of things be submitted to the Governing Body, and the resolutions adopted by the Commission will be conveyed to the Governments; and obviously any expression of opinion by the Commission as a whole on this question of the ratification of Conventions will give much more weight to any action which the Office may be able to take in this regard.

I may add, simply as an announcement, that the Holidays with Pay Convention has recently been ratified by Mexico.

Mr. SNEDDEN: Speaking first of all on behalf of the shipowners' group, I must say straight away that we are not prepared to support this resolution. All of us, by our votes or by our speeches or both, have expressed our views at Geneva on the individual Conventions. What we are asked to do to-day is really to give up our right to adhere to these views. The doctrine is being put forward that, because a Convention is adopted at Geneva by the necessary two-

thirds majority, it must necessarily be put into force. I can well understand that doctrine, and there is a good deal to be said for it provided the Constitution is altered properly. There was a serious attempt and a valiant attempt, I think, by the French Government during the discussions in the last Peace Conference to try to convert the I.L.O., and indeed the League as a whole, into a super-Parliament. That would have meant that delegates came to these conferences knowing that they were plenipotentiaries, and that if a Convention was adopted they would automatically have to put it into force in their countries. That proposal, however, was quite definitely and quite deliberately turned down, and I suggest that we cannot in this Commission undo what the Peace Conference did. If you are going to make these Conventions apply automatically once they are adopted at Geneva, you have to make certain that the States realise their responsibility.

I know that in what I am going to say I shall arouse a good deal of opposition, but I cannot help that; we have to speak quite frankly, or our discussions here will get us nowhere.

Take the Convention on hours and manning. That was carried by an overwhelming majority in 1936, by 62 votes to 17. That looks extremely impressive, but there are other facts which are equally impressive in the other direction. The delegates who voted for the Convention represented a tonnage of just under 30,000,000 gross tons. The Governments which voted against it represented 21,000,000 tons gross, or a little over, and the Governments which abstained represented 4,000,000 tons gross. There was nothing like a two-thirds majority in tonnage. At the risk of causing offence, I should like to say that there were eight Government delegations who voted for this Convention whose country had either no sea coast at all or very little, and seven of the Government delegations who voted for the Convention represented countries which each had a mercantile tonnage less than the mercantile tonnage of the *Queen Mary* alone. That is a point which must be borne in mind when considering such a far-reaching proposal as we have before us to-day, to the effect that these Conventions, if adopted at Geneva, should, irrespective of the views of the Governments, the shipowners, or, may I add, the seamen, be adopted by the respective national Governments. I am afraid that at this stage, therefore, we cannot adopt this principle, and accordingly we regret that we cannot support this resolution.

That is all that I have to say so far as the shipowners' group is concerned, but, if I may, I should like to say something in reply to Mr. Knight on the question of the Convention on hours and manning in my capacity as the British shipowners' representative

I am not speaking on behalf of my group, because the members of my group do not know what I am going to say. They may support me or they may not, but this is really a British wrangle. I regret to have to fight it out in front of the Commission, but it may be valuable if the Commission knows some at any rate of the arguments that we desire to put forward.

The British shipowners voted against the Convention on hours and manning in 1936, and we gave our reasons very fully at that time, and I am not going to repeat them all here. I want to say, however, that what has happened since 1936 had not given us any reason at all to change our views. We referred in 1936 to the fact that the whole object of the International Labour Organisation was to eliminate as far as possible unfair international competition by way of unfair conditions of labour. That is in the Peace Treaty. We did express the view then that one could not hope to deal with hours and manning separately from wages. Up to that point the I.L.O. had made no attempt, and indeed had resolutely opposed any attempt, to regulate wages—a quite understandable position, but one which, we thought, struck at the root of a Convention on hours and manning alone, because, if the industrial and political conditions inside a country permitted it, the effect of a shortening of hours or an increase of manning could be offset by a reduction in wages or by an increased Government subsidy. We thought, therefore, that this attempt to deal with two sides of what was really a three-sided problem was bound to be unfair. That is not an argument which I propose to develop to-day, but I do want to remind you that that was one of our arguments.

Nor do I propose to follow Mr. Knight into the actual detailed alterations—some in detail, some in principle—of our own National Maritime Board agreements which would be involved by ratification of the Convention on hours and manning, nor need I deal with the point—or at any rate I need not elaborate it—that the Convention itself would not secure, and indeed is not framed so as to secure, uniformity on the points with which it professes to deal.

There is no doubt that you know quite well what happens at these conferences, and it is to avoid this sort of thing that I would support Mr. Oldenbroek wholeheartedly in urging better technical preparation by some form of tripartite preparatory conference for these Conventions. It would take months, and in some cases years, for a national Government to draft a national law on hours and manning in ships, and yet we are expected as an international body to decide these matters very quickly. Well, what happens? What happens, I think, is that most of the delegates come to the conference full of hope and enthusiasm, and with the genuine inten-

tion of trying to draft a workable international instrument which will lead to uniformity. But people get tired, they begin to look at the calendar and they want to get home. National interests rear their heads, and at the end of the day what happens is that all sorts of "get-out" clauses are put in. They are adopted for the sake of peace and some kind of unanimity, and the delegates go home and say "I get out under this clause and you get out under that", and the result is a sort of John o' Groats Convention with at least eight doors, out of which the countries which want to escape can escape.

There was some of that about the Hours Convention; the over-time provisions, the home trade provisions and the manning exceptions blow very big holes in the Convention.

To-day, however, I want to say something on a much more fundamental proposition which the British shipowners put to the 1936 Committee which was drafting the Convention before it started on its work. We said that we were completely opposed to the regulation of hours in shipping by statute in the British mercantile marine. I should like to develop that a little, because it is not a catch phrase; it is a very serious proposition.

British shipowners have been accused in the past of being opposed to all international Conventions. That is not in the least true. If you take the Conventions before 1936, there were eight of them—some of the Conventions referred to on the last page of the Report of the Acting Director are not really shipping Conventions. There were eight of them, and of these eight British shipowners at the Conference voted for six. That is a pretty good record, compared with the land Conventions.

Nor, of course, are the British shipowners opposed to the regulation of hours in some way or other. We have done it on the National Maritime Board. What we say is this, that the only effective and practical way of regulating hours in shipping is by national collective agreement. We have done it in this country. I admit that the agreements are not all that either the seamen or the officers would desire, but at any rate they are extensive collective agreements, and some of their provisions inspired the provisions of the International Labour Convention.

The ratification of these Conventions means, under our constitution at any rate, statutory regulation; and, if you have statutory regulation, it means political regulation. We consider that once you introduce politics into questions of this sort, you damage, and may ultimately destroy, collective negotiations.

Mr. JARMAN: May I ask you a straight question before you say any more? No-one respects your judgment and integrity more

than I do, but I suggest that you are drawing a red herring across the trail, because you know as well as I do that the automatic application of these Conventions is not being discussed in this resolution. We ask in this resolution, "Are you opposed to ratification? Are you opposed to the international regulation of hours and manning? If so, what pronouncement is this Commission to make?"

Mr. SNEDDEN: I do not think that that is what this resolution asks, but I am willing to answer the question. Hours and manning are not mentioned; you ask for general support from our side for the ratification of all the important Maritime Conventions. I was speaking for the British shipowners—and I can speak only for them—on hours and manning, and I say that we are opposed to hours and manning, quite definitely.

I am afraid that I have rather lost the thread of my argument now. We have a very striking and a very demoralising example of what happens when you try to deal with the hours of a particular industry by legislation in this country. I refer to the coal-mining situation. Time after time this question has been debated in the House of Commons, and it has been made a national question and an international question. I think that the results have been most unfortunate, and we do not want them to happen in shipping.

Once you take this sort of thing out of the industrial field and throw it to the political wolves you get into trouble. If we do that, we get into trouble; and by "we" I do not mean the shipowners only; it is my honest belief that the officers' societies and the union would get into the same difficulty.

Mr. Oldenbroek talked about the rather unsatisfactory record of the Maritime Conventions; but the record of the Maritime Conventions from the point of view of ratification is very much better than the record of the land Conventions. I have taken the Conventions up to 1934, because it takes two or three years before you can hope to get any indication of whether a Convention is generally acceptable or not. Up to 1934, the land Conventions had an average of 16 ratifications each, whereas the shipping Conventions had an average of 27; and it must be remembered that the field of ratifications is much smaller in the case of shipping. Assuming 59 or 60 Members of the I.L.O.—there were at one time 65, but let us say about 60—that record is not too bad, because most non-maritime countries, while they may not stay away from the Conference, at any rate do abstain from ratifying, and therefore the average of 27 is out of a total number considerably less than 60.

I want to speak quite frankly about the record of the I.L.O. in the matter of the ratification of Hours Conventions. I do not think

that you can judge the I.L.O. by ratifications, but the resolution proposed by the seamen's group puts that test, and I propose to follow it.

Since the I.L.O. was established in 1919, the Conference has adopted 8 separate Conventions on hours. I think that the record is a pretty unsatisfactory one, and I should like to give some details. I am taking these details from the chart of ratifications in March 1940, which is the last one I have. The I.L.O., as I have said, has 59 or 60 Members. In 1919 there was the first Convention of all, the historic Washington Hours Convention, laying down a 48-hour week for industry in general. In 22 years there have been only 19 effective ratifications; I am leaving out the conditional ratifications. In other words, after 22 years of propaganda, sometimes of the most violent type, only one-third of the Members have ratified. The list of ratifications is instructive: Argentina, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Greece, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the Dominican Republic, India (not a 48-hour week but a 60-hour week), Lithuania, Luxemburg, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Portugal, Rumania, Spain and Uruguay. I do not want to sound like a gazetteer, but the omissions are even more instructive; some of them are very important industrial countries; and yet nearly all of them accept the principle of the 48-hour week for land industries. The omissions are: the United States of America (it is not quite fair to include the United States, perhaps; it was not a Member at the time), Australia, China, Denmark, Finland, France (conditional ratification, not effective), Germany, Great Britain, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, South Africa, Sweden and Switzerland.

Now, in Great Britain we had a constant agitation to ratify this Convention when the Labour Party was in opposition, but when they were in power they did not ratify, and why? Quite frankly, because some of the principal trade unions said that the Convention cut across their collective agreements.

Then came 1920, and the Genoa Convention on hours for shipping, which was defeated by the narrowest possible majority—one-third of a vote, I think. Then for ten years the I.L.O. left this thorny question of hours alone so far as Conventions are concerned, but in 1930 it had another shot at it, this time a Convention on hours in commerce and offices. So far there have been ten ratifications: Australia, Bulgaria, Chile, Cuba, Finland, Mexico, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Spain and Uruguay—with one or two exceptions, not a very impressive list, and there has been ten years or more to get ratifications. In 1931 there was the first Coal Mines Convention. It had only one ratification—Spain—and so it did not come into force. The Office waited four years, and then revised

the Coal Mines Convention. What happened? Of the coal-producing countries of the world there were only two ratifications, Mexico and Cuba. In 1935 we had the 40-hour week Convention, which only one country—New Zealand—ratified, and the Convention on hours of work in the glass bottle industry, which obtained 6 ratifications. In 1936 there was the Convention on public works, a matter entirely within the scope of Governments, but only one ratification—again New Zealand—saved this Convention from scoring a duck. Also in 1936, we had the Convention on hours and manning for shipping.

I am sorry to go into so much detail, but I want the Commission to realise that the failure to obtain ratification of the Convention on hours is not simply a shipping affair; it applies to all the Hours Conventions of the I.L.O. I suggest that the real reason is that the advanced countries at any rate do feel that the detailed settling of hours is a matter for individual regulation by collective agreement by free associations of employers and free associations of employees in the respective countries. I think that we should be honest with ourselves and admit that.

But the I.L.O. can take encouragement from this fact. You cannot judge the success of the I.L.O. by looking at the chart of ratifications only. There can be no question that the Washington Convention on the 48-hour week and some of the subsequent Conventions have had an influence, and a very great influence, in reducing hours throughout the world; but do not let us make ratification a form of idolatry. I say frankly that our own British agreements were in some cases made in anticipation of Geneva, and I am glad to say that they were recognised, and some of their provisions were put into the Geneva Conventions. I think that the I.L.O. is quite entitled to take credit for that.

I am sorry to speak at such great length, but there is one final question with which I want to deal, and that is the question of ratifying the Convention on hours and manning as a matter of war safety. I do not believe that you can ratify it constitutionally for the duration of the war, but that is a constitutional point which I need not develop. On the merits of the question, I simply support what Mr. Ernest Bevin, the Minister of Labour, said three or four months ago in the House of Commons. No one can accuse Mr. Bevin of being anything but a friend and a staunch supporter of the International Labour Organisation, but Mr. Bevin himself said this: "It would not be practicable to give effect to the requirements of the Convention during wartime on British ships".

Mr. TUDEHOPE: I have listened carefully to the remarks of Mr. Snedden on this very important question of hours and man-

ning, and I want to take my mind back for a moment to the 1936 Conference at Geneva. Approaching that Conference, my impressions were that here at last we had a gathering that could get together and deal with important questions relating to the maritime industry, and paramount among those questions was the question of hours and manning. I knew of the strong objection on the part of certain countries to what has just been referred to by Mr. Snedden as "unfair competition". Some countries were in a position to employ labour on terms which enabled them to compete unfairly with other countries. I thought that here was an opportunity to adopt what might be termed a levelling-up process, by which all the countries could be brought into line on the question at any rate of hours and manning, which has a great bearing on the running of shipping generally.

I listened attentively to the discussions at that Conference, and Mr. Snedden has to-day repeated in a very few words the attitude which was adopted by the British shipowners and the British Government in the discussions on that Convention. The Convention on hours and manning was not drawn up and dealt with in any very hurried fashion, such as has been suggested; it was the subject of hours and hours of discussion in the Committee, and it was not drawn up in the spirit of "getting away from Geneva" to which Mr. Snedden refers. It was drawn up in the calm atmosphere of a Committee, and it was felt, as a result of the experience of representatives from all sides, that the Convention would provide a suitable method of applying the standard hours to shipping internationally. That, I felt, was the best method of overcoming the difficulties to which the shipowners referred.

The Convention obtained the necessary two-thirds majority, and I returned to Australia feeling that at last we had arrived at something which would be of great importance to the workers in the shipping industry, and something which would eliminate the unfair competition which has been referred to, and for the complaint about which there is, of course, some justification. There is a feeling in all shipping countries that on important questions such as standard hours and manning some standard should be set so that all countries would have to observe at any rate a minimum, such as was suggested by the 1936 Conference.

My feeling was, too, that as the 1936 Conference consisted for the most part of representatives from democratic countries, those whose views were not accepted by the Conference would, on returning to their respective countries, say: "Well, we did our best to convince the Conference that the 56-hour provisions and the manning scale should not be introduced, but, now that these things

have been embodied in a Convention which has been adopted, we feel that we must accept the decision of the Conference". I felt that that should be the position, and I felt that that was the atmosphere which prevailed at that Conference; and, that being so, I reported back to the Australian Government and said I thought it would not be very long before the requisite number of countries—I think five, speaking from memory—ratified the Convention, and that these provisions on standard hours and manning would be brought into operation throughout the shipping industry of the world, or at any rate of those countries which were represented at that Conference. I was amazed to find that no consideration was given to it, particularly by the British Government and the British shipowners, and I am amazed to find that the position still is as it was prior to that Convention being drawn up.

Mr. Snedden said to-day that the shipowners strongly believed in the elimination of unfair competition. The Convention of 1936 was the only possible means by which that unfair competition could be eliminated. Then he went on to say that the only possible way of dealing with the question of standard hours was by national agreement. What does that tell us? That Great Britain will deal with the question of standard hours only according to the views and principles of Great Britain from the shipowners' and employees' point of view.

Mr. Snedden is also very apprehensive about the application of standard hours being dealt with by statute, but what is the position in most countries in this respect? I must refer to my own country, Australia. All the standard hours in Australia are operated by statute; they all come through the arbitration court, which is a court set up by the Australian Government, and all the laws administered by the arbitration court are statute laws. No difficulty at all is experienced in Australia in dealing with these questions, not only standard hours but other questions which are embodied in the awards of the Commonwealth of Australia, and no political influence operates in regard to the awards generally.

Mr. Snedden also mentioned that details regarding hours should be left to the countries themselves. We agree that the principle there is sound, but we say that the principle should be laid down in an international Convention. I had a striking instance of this in Australia recently. The Government of Australia felt that it was necessary to bring the shipping industry into line with shore industries. That was an outstanding move for the shipping industry, because the seamen's organisations in Australia had invariably been told by the shipowners, in the arbitration courts, that it was not possible to apply shore conditions to the shipping industry.

We asked them why, and the only reply we received was "Because the shipping industry is different". However, the Government of Australia felt that the time had arrived when an attempt should be made to bring the shipping industry into line with shore industries, particularly as far as standard hours are concerned, and for that reason they introduced, early this year, a regulation which provided that the standard hours in the shipping industry should be 44.

It was then left to the Maritime Industry Commission to decide the method by which the standard hours laid down by the Government should be applied to the different sections of workers on board ship. That was the job of the Maritime Industry Commission just as in this country it would be the job of the various boards set up to control conditions on board ship. But that did not affect the standard hours; the task of the Commission in Australia was to apply the 44-hour principle to the various sections in a way which would meet any difficulties which might arise in its application. That was a task which needed a considerable amount of discussion, but it did not present any insurmountable difficulty. We found when meeting the shipowners in conference or on the Maritime Industry Commission that we were able to get down to a practical method of applying the 44-hour week to the shipping industry. So much for the argument which had been advanced by the shipowners for years, during all the time that the seamen's organisation had been hammering at the arbitration court to have the standard hours applied to the maritime industry.

What has been done in Australia can be done in other countries where there is a system such as applies in Australia and in Great Britain. It could easily be done here. To my mind, no argument has been advanced why the Convention on hours and manning should not be ratified. I was not convinced on that point by what was said in 1936—probably I should take some convincing!—and no further argument has been advanced to-day, other than the fact that the shipowners in Great Britain do not want to apply the 56-hour week. That was the sort of position which the shipowners adopted in Australia prior to the 44-hour week being introduced, but in Australia, as I have already said, the shipowners had no option in the matter; they had to apply it, and it was applied according to the best practical methods so far as the different sections on board ship are concerned.

That deals with the position so far as Australia is concerned, and I cannot see any reason why this Commission should not adopt unanimously the resolution which has been proposed on behalf of the seamen's group. To my mind, and particularly at

the present time, it is a question of the utmost importance that not only the question of standard hours but the question of manning should be given the greatest consideration, and countries such as Great Britain should, in my opinion, take a lead in the direction of ratifying the Convention. I felt at Geneva—and in saying this I think that I am voicing the views of my comrades here—that the other countries engaged in the shipping industry were waiting for a lead from Great Britain to adopt this Convention, and, until Great Britain does adopt this Convention, I feel quite sure there will be no additional adherents to it.

After all, is 56 hours a very great concession for which to ask, when you find the progress which is being made in other countries and in other sections of industry? Is 56 hours a very great claim to make upon the shipowners, when men are working day in and day out, week in and week out? Is it too much to ask that men on board ship should be granted the same number of hours as men employed ashore? In the application of it, it may be found possible to devise ways and means by which the men can be given additional leave, as happens in Australia in one section of the industry, where the 44-hour week is applied in such a way that the additional 12 hours free in the week is added to the leave. That enables the 44-hour principle to be observed for seamen, and at the same time gives them some very much needed relief and recreation and periods of liberty from their ship.

I strongly appeal to the Commission generally to adopt this resolution, and, although I think that the shipowners in Great Britain will take some convincing, in view of their attitude in 1936 and to-day, I strongly appeal to the British shipowners and to the British Government too. It is not a great deal to ask; it is not too much to ask that the workers in the shipping industry should be put on a basis which is slightly worse than the basis of those in shore industries. As I have already said, we were told in Australia that it was impossible to apply to shipping the hours that were applied ashore, but it was found, when the 44-hour week was imposed, not to be impossible, and the shipowners must have known, in advancing their arguments before, that it was not impossible; but like other shipowners, they had no desire to apply the shorter standard hours to their industry. I feel that this resolution should be adopted unanimously. There are countries represented on the other side where the conditions are much better than those set out in the Convention on hours and manning, and in those circumstances there should be no difficulty in the representatives from those countries agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. OLDENBROEK: I think that a good deal of what Mr. Snedden

said was irrelevant. If this were the International Labour Conference, and we were to discuss the Conventions adopted at the different sessions of the Conference, we should also press for the ratification of those Conventions; and in saying that I cut out all that Mr. Snedden has been saying about them.

Is it not true that the shipping industry is the most international industry, and is it not true that in particular in the shipping industry it is necessary to have international legislation in order to prevent unfair competition?

Mr. Snedden said it would be necessary in the future to hold extra technical Conferences. That is what we did. We had an extra technical Conference in 1935, the year before 1936, so that we went through that process; and yet the British shipowners were not able to convince the representatives of the Governments of other countries or of the seamen, or, I am pleased to say, also a few shipowners, that it was undesirable to accept this Convention on hours and manning, which, after all, is the most important, and to which I want to restrict myself.

Mr. Snedden said that it was not only a question of hours and manning but also a question of wages. There would be something in his argument if it were true that in the countries where the hours were worst the wages were best, but that is not true; in the countries with the worst hours the wages were the worst, too. His argument, therefore, goes against him. His argument should be used against the shipowners of those countries where wages were worst. But, Mr. Snedden, if the shipowners want to negotiate with us about the fixing of an international minimum wage, either through the I.L.O. or outside it, we shall be prepared to meet you and to negotiate with you. I hope that that will lead you to accept our resolution, because we realise the difficulties that exist and we want to smooth them out and get them out of the way.

Mr. Snedden says that this should be done by national collective agreements. That must mean the balance of power between the two sides in any one particular country. What else does it mean? It is true that we were surprised—whether agreeably or otherwise I shall not say—when in 1936, just before the International Conference met, the British shipowners agreed to bring about an improvement in the very bad working hours and conditions on board British ships. They were able to do that, and we had the feeling that they did it to make it impossible for us to get general consent for the Convention. We had that feeling, and I think that we were right.

If it were true that working hours can be regulated only by national collective agreements, then I think it would be wise advice

to the International Labour Office to close the shop; because, if we cannot do it through the I.L.O., what is the I.L.O. for?

Mr. Snedden told us a good deal about the Hours Conventions applying to land industries. There would be something in what he said if in the countries which have not ratified the Conventions the working hours were longer than those laid down in the Conventions; but that is not the case. Many of the countries which have not ratified have the 48-hour week, or even better stipulations than those in the Washington Convention. The Convention on hours and manning provides only for a 56-hour week for seamen, but it will not be long before we propose a 48-hour week for them. I repeat that if the conditions in countries which did not ratify were worse than those laid down in the Convention there might be something in the argument, but in fact the opposite is the case. With regard to the shipping industry, however, it is otherwise; those who do not want to ratify have the worst conditions, and that is why ratification must be brought about.

I will leave it at that, but I should like to express this hope. We realise that the big stumbling block in getting ratification and adoption of the Convention has been the attitude of the British shipowners. I appeal to all the shipowners to support our resolution, and I expect that in particular the shipowners of the United States, of Australia, and of Norway, where the conditions are so much better, will support us.

Captain COOMBS: I should like to congratulate Mr. Snedden on the extremely able and courteous way in which he has presented an extremely bad case. Despite his efforts, I am certain that he has convinced no one on this side of the room of the soundness of his case.

I merely wish to emphasise the point made by Mr. Oldenbroek just now. As I understand it, part of Mr. Snedden's case is the general proposition that hours and manning and wages are linked up together. That does not help him at all in the special position so far as British officers at any rate are concerned, because we find that in the case of British officers, and of those officers whose conditions are pegged to those of Great Britain—Poland, Free France and Denmark—the wages are lower than those in the countries which have found it possible by national agreement to regulate officers' hours on terms similar or superior to those laid down by the 1936 Convention on hours and manning. That is all that I have to say in reply to Mr. Snedden's case.

Mr. CURRAN: So far as the United States of America is concerned, both from the point of view of the operators and that of

the unions we should have no difficulty at all, as far as I can see, in supporting this resolution.

Commander LEE: I will speak for myself.

Mr. CURRAN: I recognise the fact that Commander Lee can speak very ably for himself, but I also reserve the right to express opinions as to how people should feel, in my opinion, based on what the printed word says. We have the eight-hour day, we have our holidays and we have our overtime; and in all our negotiations with the operators in the United States—and I hope I shall not be interrupted here—we have always heard, as the basis of all argument against reduction in hours or against overtime, the statement by the American shipping operators that "We will never be able to compete with other merchant marine operators in other countries". For that reason, I think it should be a very simple matter for the American operators and the American union representatives here to support this resolution, and so I, on the basis of what the unions and the operators have already agreed to in the United States, certainly add my support 100 per cent. to this resolution.

Commander LEE: I was at Geneva and I voted for the Convention, but I certainly left there with no idea that it would be accepted, and I do not see how Mr. Tudehope could have that idea.

Mr. OLDENBROEK: He had it because you had voted in favour!

Commander LEE: I think that if the seamen had put forward a Convention in Geneva which they knew would be accepted by the British Government, we should not have had the difficulties with which we are faced to-day; and that is why I want all of us here to keep in mind the results of the Geneva Conventions. We must agree among ourselves, and it is quite hopeless to attempt to agree where things are as one-sided as they were in Geneva. We have on the delegations to the International Labour Conference one employee, one employer, and two Government representatives. At least two or three of the employer representatives could hardly be considered as in the same category as the rest of the employers there.

There is no doubt that the American law is of greater liberality than even the Convention finally adopted. It was therefore in our interest and always will be in our interest to raise labour conditions throughout the world to the level of our own; but we do not believe that that can be done in one jump. But we do think that it can be done over a period of time, provided that you on the other side

of the house will approach the problem as you must approach it in your relations between unions and employers; in other words, we compromise on our difficulties and differences and finally come to a complete accord which is, needless to say, not entirely satisfactory to either side, but we see the common sense of getting on with the job as rapidly as we can and on as sound a basis as can be adopted.

There certainly was no doubt in my mind in the 1936 Conference as to the position of the British Government. I think that if you review Mr. Jenkins' remarks at that Conference you will find that he quite definitely assured you that the Convention would not be accepted. It has been said here that it requires only five ratifications to bring it into force, but that is not quite true; it was amended so as practically to leave the decision in the hands of the British Government, because it requires the approval of five Members with over 1,000,000 tons of shipping, and there was very little likelihood of getting that unless you got the approval of the British Government.

This leads, of course, to the other point which has been raised, that of the representation of Governments on this Commission. We can get along better if the shipowners and seamen will reconcile their differences either here or at home and then approach the Governments with an agreement; and it must be pretty nearly a unanimous agreement, as nearly unanimous as possible. If you are going to attempt to settle these things on a basis of voting, I think that it will always be possible for you to outvote us, but it will never be possible for you to get what you want unless you are willing to compromise and bring at least a very large percentage of us along with you.

I am, of course, entirely in favour of all Governments accepting the Conventions that were adopted in Geneva, but I am not in favour of the attitude of forcing them down the throat of any Government, and I think we should be very unwise if we attempted to do that. I hope, therefore, that the seamen's group will attempt to arrive at a sound solution, one which all of us can support, and not just one or two of us who have a selfish interest. If you will approach the problem from that point of view, I can assure you that you will get further.

Mr. JARMAN: Commander Lee has not put forward a proposal, but I will try to bring one about. I will sum up the position in a few words. I should like to apologise to Mr. Snedden for the interjection which threw him out of his stride, but he did it all so beautifully, and he knew all the time that it was so wonderfully mislead-

ing. He assumed that this resolution implies that Conventions when adopted should be automatically ratified. That was not and is not the intention. We do not want and have never even tried to argue that question here this morning, although perhaps a good deal could be said in favour of it.

As I understand it—and I stand to be corrected by the Office—the present practice is that each country decides whether to ratify or not. If that had to be changed, it would have to be changed for all countries, and then not only for the Maritime Conventions. All that we ask in this resolution, as I understand it, is that the Commission should agree that these Conventions are good, and that efforts should therefore be made to get them ratified, and that those countries which believe that seamen should have a decent and square deal should not only say so, as they have said so, but should do something about it. What I am saying now is this: in view of the war situation let us ask the Governments—and we ask for your support in this—to ratify these Conventions and implement them, having regard to the exigencies of the war situation, and give the seamen, who are risking so much at the moment, some hope for the future. That is the intention of the resolution, and is certainly the request to you from the British seamen's delegation, at any rate.

MR. CURRAN: I should like to get one question quite clear. Commander Lee said—and I do not want to argue the point at all; I just want to get some enlightenment about it—that we should come forward with a resolution or with proposals which would be acceptable to the British Government and to British shipowners. I do not understand that; I am not clear whether or not that means that this mixed Commission of international delegations is dominated by the British Government or the British shipowners. I understood that this was a free gathering of delegations from all the maritime countries of the world, seeking to deal with unfair practices and also to build up better standards for seamen as a whole on a world basis, and not under the domination of any particular shipowners or Government. I understood this was a body to study the conditions of seamen without any selfishness whatever and to arrive at an understanding of how to recommend to the various Governments ways and means of bettering those conditions. That is the first point. The second point is to secure some form of standardisation of minimums so as to form a floor, so to speak, from which we can begin to work upwards.

That was my understanding of the purpose of this Commission, that it was to eliminate what I have heard many operators speak

of as "unfair competition", and what the seamen speak of as unfair practices so far as labour is concerned, and unsatisfactory conditions so far as welfare and manning and hours and many other matters are concerned. I thought that that was the basis on which our discussions took place and on which we tried to reach some form of agreement. . . . I think that we should lay everything on the table as being the affair of everyone, and on that basis begin to move without any selfish desires and without any desire to retain what might be traditional or what might have been our ideas in the past. We are moving into a new world and attempting to replace conditions which were the cause of the conflagration that exists to-day and to prevent such things from ever happening again. Unfair competition basically was one of those things, and unfair conditions basically were another.

We want to prevent a repetition of that, and yet we hear the old arguments, and we see someone wanting to retain—and I must say on a selfish basis; I cannot say anything else, from the way in which I have seen this approached—some of the traditional things which belonged to a certain group. I cannot see that that sort of thing can have any place in such a Commission as this, which is sitting here trying to deal with problems which concern the many, and not any particular group.

The CHAIRMAN: I am fortunate in this Chair in having no nationality. The position, as I understand it, is that this Convention comes into operation when five countries having at least 1,000,000 tons of shipping each ratify it; and one of the Governments which have not ratified it is the British Government, which is quite separate from and independent of the British shipowners.

It is true to say that other employers on other subjects are against the statutory regulation of hours, but the British Government has gone in for a good deal of statutory regulation of hours.

I have in mind particularly what Commander Lee said, and I am looking at the matter, I hope, quite impartially. He suggested that the way in which the Convention has been discussed has made it more difficult for the Convention to be accepted than might otherwise have been the case. I think that what is missing in the discussion this morning is any statement of why this Convention is so difficult. For example, I have heard the observation made that there are doors in this Convention through which everybody can pass, even though they have accepted it and ratified it. While it may not be possible to do anything here and now, and you will not, perhaps, wish to do other than take this resolution as it stands, I do recall the case of the Docks Convention, which certain coun-

tries were not able to accept because of certain provisions in it, none of them of very serious importance but all of them having a practical effect, and so there was another meeting at which certain changes were made in that Convention, without at all destroying any one of its principles, and as a consequence countries were able to ratify it.

If I understand Commander Lee accurately, he would, I think, agree that there is something here to get together on and to discuss, not, perhaps, now, but as between the employers' and workers' groups of the various countries, to see whether something can be agreed in the light of modern conditions which can be accepted more easily by the various countries.

I ought also to say that this subject is, I believe, still under active consideration in various countries, and it may be that in any case some discussions will take place; but, while we may have to vote on this resolution, I do not think it can be said that the subject is exhausted so far as the shipowners and seamen are concerned.

Commander LEE: I should like to clear up Mr. Curran's point as to the domination of this or any other meeting by the British Government. I am not used to that myself, and I cited the British Government merely because it was quite clear at Geneva that they were the principal objectors to certain terms. So far as the shipowners are concerned, the British shipowners were supported almost unanimously by all the other shipowners. It was not, therefore, a British shipowners' matter at all, but all the shipowners except those of the U.S.A., and perhaps Russia, but I am not sure.

Mr. OLDENBROEK: And France, and I think Australia.

Mr. HALLSWORTH: As one of the representatives of the Governing Body, and as representing the workers' group on that body, I should like to make one or two observations on the situation in which we find ourselves now. I cannot think that Mr. Snedden, in the very competent (from his point of view) statement that he made, had the idea that this Joint Maritime Commission would be used as an instrument to defeat the central purpose of the International Labour Organisation. It does seem to me—and I have been a good many times to Geneva, over a long period—that the whole idea of adopting Conventions is to put a bottom into the conditions of labour in the industries to which the Conventions apply. If that be so, I think it would be futile for the International Labour Organisation to be urged to do this or that or to be urged not to do this or that and merely to await the course of events as

to whether it would be desirable or not to apply in practice Conventions which have been adopted at the various sessions of the Conference. I think that it would be futile to meet at all if that were the way in which we approached this question.

It is obvious that there are difficulties, at least in the minds of some people here, about whether certain Conventions can be ratified. I am afraid that unless a realistic attitude is adopted at the stage which we have now reached, events will run away with both sides, and we shall find ourselves in this position, that circumstances will have arisen during the war period which will have a profound influence on post-war circumstances, and that men who are engaged in various services and industries ministering to the life of the community, nationally and internationally, will say "We are not going on any more on these conditions, and, whatever the price to be paid which will enable us to get out of these conditions, that price will have to be paid, even if it is in blood and tears".

We have to face the fact that we cannot return to the 1939 world. This we must all realise, whether we represent Governments or employers or workers. We have to reconstruct the world on the basis of being constructive ourselves.

Now, what seems to me to be the right way of proceeding on this as on many other things which are worrying us to-day, in the special circumstances of wartime, is to agree that it is not sufficient merely to say that there are difficulties. Those difficulties have to be discussed, and there must be an attempt on both sides to overcome them. If this Joint Maritime Commission can bring home to both sides a realisation that, whatever the difficulties may be on the shipowners' side and on the seamen's side, the two sides will have to get together in the various countries, then the discussions here will have served the purpose of focusing attention on what are the chief points of interest to both sides, and, if the representatives of the organisations on both sides in the various countries will begin to look at these difficulties to see how far they can be overcome, we shall make an approach to the point when there will be agreement not only on the various points dealt with in the Conventions but on others also, and we shall be able to make progress, because the principal countries concerned in maritime affairs will have reached agreement on substantial points, and all that the Convention will be required for is to act as a spur to the more backward countries, and also, when embodied in legislation, to enable the "operators", as Mr. Curran calls them, to work these Conventions, applying the legislation without fear that somebody else will blackleg them and open the door to unfair competition, both in their own countries and elsewhere, on the important matters on which agreement has been reached.

I am only concerned to avoid a futile approach to these questions. It is not sufficient, in my opinion, merely to indulge in theories about whether State regulation in any circumstances can be entertained, or whether it can be entertained in no circumstances. I think that a practical approach must be made to face the difficulties which war experience has thrown into greater relief than ever; and, unless we do that, we shall find ourselves at the end of the war in greater difficulties than we have ever faced before. I do hope, therefore, that a realistic attitude will be adopted, and that an attempt will be made with goodwill on both sides of the Commission to face the difficulties that are hampering an international understanding on the points embodied in the various Conventions.

Sir John FORBES WATSON: I represent the employers' group of the Governing Body, and I shall be very brief. This is the first time that I have had the opportunity of attending a meeting of the Joint Maritime Commission, but I have been, perhaps, at more Geneva Conferences than anyone else here, for I have gone there for twenty years as British employers' representative.

I should like to say that I am very much impressed by the practical, harmonious and businesslike way in which the meetings of this Maritime Commission have been conducted. When I think of our meetings in Geneva, I do not remember any occasion on which things went as smoothly and in as businesslike a way as they have done here. Why that should be I do not know, but that is the impression which I have formed.

So far as the questions before you are concerned, I do not propose to intervene. I have long ago learned the lesson that it is a dangerous thing to put your finger between the bark and the tree, and I have also learned that those men who go down to the sea in ships and do business in the great waters have a different tradition, a different temperament and a different outlook from those of us who have, perhaps, the greater fortune to remain on firm land. So all the time I have been at Geneva I have always stood out for shipping questions being dealt with by shipping men. You will not get me, therefore, intervening in what you are discussing.

I will, however, say this. When you talk about the Hours Conventions adopted in Geneva, I have been through every one of those discussions, and I wish that I had met Mr. Curran twenty years ago. He talks about Conventions which lay down a minimum. That is not what they lay down, as I know them; they often lay down a maximum. I have always said that they should lay down a minimum, and having put that basis there, allow the countries which are able to do so to go a little further, proceeding from that

level. When you examine these Conventions, however, you will find that that is not what they do.

Mr. Hallsworth talked about blacklegs. That is exactly what we suffer from in the case of these Geneva Conventions. I have spent a good deal of time for many years on a Committee called the Committee on Article 408, which was set up to study how far the countries which had ratified Conventions were carrying them out; and I stand here without fear of contradiction and say that there was wholesale evasion of the obligations undertaken. It is because I did believe that my country would carry out what it said it would do that I was often caused to oppose things for which otherwise I should have voted.

I do not think that you can start revising Conventions here to secure their ratification.

Mr. HALLSWORTH: I do not suggest that.

Sir John FORBES WATSON: I think you will all go home feeling that it has been worth while being here and being in contact with each other, and proving to the world that employers and workers in a great industry in free countries can still talk and work together,

Mr. SNEDDEN: I do not know what happens now, but do not the Governments get the record at any rate of the decisions taken at this meeting? If they do, they will get this resolution, and they will get the views of the seamen's group and the views of the shipowners' group, and I suppose they will also get the suggestions which have been made about some of the technical difficulties in this Convention and in others. We have not specified any of them to-day, but there are technical difficulties, though they vary in different countries. The idea has been thrown out that, apart from the question of principle which I have raised, it might be possible to revise the Convention. Is that the idea?

Mr. JARMAN: I am quite clear what must happen now: a record vote will have to be taken. I have to go back and explain to a crowd of men who have been told that they have saved the world that it is impossible for us, apparently, from the speeches which have been made, to get you to do, even during the war, what you say we deserve. I have to tell them that it is impossible to get you to say even that you will ask for these things to be implemented after the war, having regard to the fact that during the war you may hold that they cannot be brought into operation. I for my part ask for a record vote to be taken.

Mr. Curran, Mr. Tudehope and Mr. Oldenbroek supported the demand for a record vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I propose to take this vote after the adjournment, and in the meantime I think it would be useful for the position to be considered, so that it may not be just vote against vote, of which we have had so much, but that there will also be some hope that immediately some practical examination of such difficulties as exist will take place. I have had the unfortunate experience of arguing with people about Conventions which they have never read, which they have never gone through from first to last, and which they do not understand, but about which they have worked themselves into a most feverish state, as to whether those Conventions should or should not be ratified. I think that as this is an expert Commission, and as its proceedings are private, while this resolution must, of course, express the views of the seamen's side as to ratification, it would be useful if you could discuss whether you could suggest from this Commission some way in which the position could be considered immediately and objectively by experts, in order to see whether such difficulties as exist cannot be met without destroying what is the chief part of the Convention.

I accept, of course, the position of principle which Mr. Snedden has put forward on behalf of the British shipowners, as against regulation by statute altogether. That stands by itself. But I do think that this Commission should try to be constructive about this matter, because it has such a great bearing on the future of the International Labour Organisation and international discussions.

Mr. JARMAN: And winning the war.

The CHAIRMAN: And winning the war, yes. I feel that a good many people are disappointed because of the differences which occur, which sometimes can be reconciled by parties who really wish to reach agreement. We do not want simply to say that everybody is being entirely unreasonable; we want to find a constructive way of handling what is, I think, the most important subject, or almost the most important subject, before this Commission now.

Seventh Sitting, 29 June 1942

Mr. SNEDDEN: The shipowners' group have considered the resolution in the light of the discussion which took place this morning. We do not want to be misunderstood at all, but this is a block resolution, and is a departure from the usual practice. It is asking

us to exercise pressure upon Governments, and we do not think that that is the job of this Commission. Equally, however, we do not want it to go out that we are opposed to ameliorations in conditions of employment, or that we are in any way impeding the war effort; that would be a complete misunderstanding of our position. We have therefore decided to abstain from voting, and, if the resolution is put to the vote, we shall record our abstentions.

Mr. JARMAN: We do not want to be put in the position of embarrassing the shipowners any more than is necessary, but I should be a lunatic, and a criminal lunatic, to allow the opportunity to pass of establishing at any rate the promise after the war of something more for our men than we had before the war. I should like to ask for an adjournment, so that I can consult the seamen's group on the position created.

At this stage the Commission adjourned for a brief period for group consultations.

Mr. JARMAN: The seamen's group have conveyed to me that they could not possibly allow the situation to remain where it was without at least one final attempt to get some agreement, and we hope unanimous agreement, by suggesting a modification which is aimed to meet any possible or conceivable objection on the part of the shipowners or anyone else. I am asked, therefore, to amend our resolution by striking out the last three lines, that is to say "The Joint Maritime Commission calls upon the Governments concerned to bring about ratification of the Conventions in question with the least possible delay", and substituting for them "The Joint Maritime Commission urges Governments to ratify as soon as possible those Conventions which present no substantial difficulties, and to institute immediately consultations between the Governments and the organisations of shipowners and seafarers on the other Conventions, for the purpose of securing the immediate application of the essential principles of those Conventions and the overcoming of the technical obstacles to ratification".

There are three items there: (1) the ratification of those Conventions which present no substantial difficulties; (2) the others to be discussed on the tripartite principle; and (3) this is to be with a view not merely to examining the difficulties but to making an effort to overcome them.

After another short adjournment for group consultations the seamen's group submitted a revised text which was accepted by the shipowners' group and adopted unanimously by the Commission without further discussion. The final text of the resolution is given in Part III.

COMPOSITION OF THE JOINT MARITIME COMMISSION

Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Sitzings, 29 and 30 June 1942

(At the Seventh Sitting the seamen's group submitted the following resolution:

That the Joint Maritime Commission is of the opinion that it is desirable to include Government representatives in its composition.

The resolution was moved by Mr. Bécu, who was supported in the subsequent discussion by Messrs. Price, Oldenbroek and Tudehope.

The spokesmen for the seamen's group pointed out that the Joint Maritime Commission was the only body of the kind within the International Labour Organisation which was bipartite in composition, all similar bodies being tripartite. They expressed dissatisfaction with the rate of progress achieved in the consideration of maritime problems and attributed this, at any rate in large part, to the composition of the Commission, which tended to lead to deadlocks, the two groups on the Commission taking up opposing attitudes and there being no third element either to assist in securing agreement or to ensure that a decision of some kind was reached. The representatives of Governments had to take part in the special Maritime Sessions of the International Labour Conference, to which the work of the Commission finally led up, and they also took part in preparatory technical meetings such as that held before the 1936 Maritime Session of the Conference. While there were some matters that might be satisfactorily dealt with by bipartite discussions, all the important problems required action by Governments and there was no good reason why Governments should not be represented at the initial stages of the discussions as well as at the final stages. In view of the importance and complexity of the problems with which the shipping industry was already faced and still more of those with which it would be faced in the period of reconstruction after the war, it was essential that the machinery of the International Labour Organisation for dealing with those problems should be as efficient as it could be made, and in the view of the seamen's group that entailed the enlargement of the membership of the Commission so as to include representatives of Governments.

The shipowners' spokesmen were Messrs. Snedden and Hudig. They took the view that the fact that the Commission was unique in having a bipartite composition was no argument against the continuance of the system; it might well be that other industries

could profit from the example of the shipping industry. Progress in the solution of maritime problems might perhaps have been slower in the past than could have been wished, but times had changed and the fact that agreement could be reached in a bi-partite body had been amply demonstrated by the remarkable unanimity that had been developed at that session of the Commission. Nor had progress in maritime matters been in fact so unsatisfactory as had been alleged. Judged by the ratification of Conventions, the record in respect of the Maritime Conventions was at least as good as, if not better than, the record in respect of Conventions dealing with workers on shore; and moreover, ratification was not the only test of the influence for good of the International Labour Organisation, for it was well known that marked progress had been achieved under the stimulus of the Organisation's Conventions in many countries even when those countries did not ratify particular Conventions. There was no question that Governments must be represented at the Maritime Sessions of the International Labour Conference, but it did not follow that they must be represented at all the prior stages of the discussions. Experience in national negotiations demonstrated that the intervention of Governments, so far from facilitating agreement, not infrequently created greater difficulties. The shipowners were no less anxious than the seamen that the problems of the industry should be adequately dealt with, but they were convinced that the surest basis for real progress lay in frank and entirely unhampered discussions, such as had taken place during that session of the Commission, between representatives of the two parties directly concerned. The introduction of Government representatives would mean great difficulty in allocating seats on the Commission and the replacement of an efficient body by a very large and unwieldy body.

There had been no request from Governments for representation on the Commission. It had to be remembered also that the whole question of the future of the International Labour Organisation had to be considered by the Governing Body and it might be that very important constitutional and administrative changes would have to be made. If a vote were taken at that session the shipowners would be obliged to vote against the resolution, but they thought the wiser course would be to leave the question of the admission of Government representatives for discussion at a later session.

The Chairman, in winding up the general discussion, emphasised that the proposal to defer a decision was made for the purpose of enabling all the merits of the case to be considered. He reminded the Commission of the difference between the position of Govern-

ment representatives at any international meeting and that of representatives of the other groups. The seamen's and shipowners' members of the Commission represented their groups and it could therefore be expected that any decision they reached would be made effective; but if Government members were added to the Commission each of them would represent only his own Government, and Governments not represented would not be bound at all by any decision they might take. The Chairman also suggested that great care should be taken before deciding to permit political or bureaucratic intervention in the affairs of any industry; he felt very strongly that the future of real international relationships depended on the strength of voluntary organisations of workers and employers, regulating conditions in their own industries, the political element being brought in only so far as those conditions had to be adjusted to conditions in the community generally. Finally, the Chairman suggested that the Commission should consider whether the resolutions already adopted by the Commission, which asked for immediate action by Governments, might not lose something of their force if the Commission itself were at the same time to intimate that it was a moribund body, to be replaced in future by a body of another, and still unknown, composition.

Informal discussions took place subsequently between representatives of the two groups, with the assistance of the Chairman and the other representatives of the Governing Body. As a result, Mr. Oldenbroek, for the seamen's representatives, announced that, having regard more particularly to the importance of ensuring the effective continuance of the work of the Commission until more was known about the future work and organisation of the I.L.O. as a whole, they had decided to withdraw their resolution for the time being, reserving their right to submit it to a future session of the Commission. Mr. Snedden expressed the shipowners' appreciation of this decision.)

Appointment of a Consultative Sub-committee

Eighth and Ninth Sitzings, 30 June 1942

(The Commission decided to appoint an informal consultative sub-committee for the purpose of assisting the Office in its maritime work and acting as a link with the Office between sessions of the Commission.

The sub-committee was constituted as follows:

Chairman: Sir Frederick Leggett

Shipowners' representatives: Mr. Hudig
 Mr. Lee (*Substitute:* Mr. Clinton H. Kemp)
 Mr. Snedden
 Mr. Worsoe

Seamen's representatives: Mr. Bécu (*Substitute:* Mr. Coombs)
 Mr. Haugen
 Mr. Jarman
 Mr. Oldenbroek

It was understood that all members could be replaced by substitutes as occasion required.)

Safety Measures

Second Sitting, 27 June 1942

The SECRETARY: The printed document on this subject submitted to the Commission ("The War and Merchant Seamen, II") was prepared on the basis of the information available up to a month or two ago. Meanwhile, the British Ministry of War Transport has been engaged in revising its regulations in the light of experience; and, by the courtesy of the Ministry, we have been able to obtain a limited number of copies of a draft of their revised and consolidated regulations. No doubt, members of the Commission will wish to see what changes, if any, have been made in the British regulations on particular points, and out of their experience they may be able to make criticisms or suggestions which will, of course, be recorded. Some of the regulations, both old and new, are obviously of interest only in war conditions; on the other hand, there are some changes which have occurred under the pressure of war which are of permanent interest, as, for instance, the very substantial improvements in food supplies on lifeboats.

As for the upshot of the discussion, that is for the Commission to say, but it would seem reasonable to suppose that the Commission would like to consider whether anything can be done to secure the wider adoption of what has been shown to be desirable by the experience of the countries which have been most actively engaged in the war over the longest period of time, so that the combined experience of all the countries may be made available in order to ensure better protection for the lives of seamen of all merchant navies.

Mr. JARMAN: If ever there was an opportunity given to anyone to pay the debt which so many of us have said we owe to our merchant seamen, here it is. Surely there can be little if any difference

of opinion on what we may suggest should be done to ensure that men who every day and every hour are risking their lives shall have at least a chance of survival.

In the little time at our disposal, and thanks in the main to the excellent document prepared by the Office, we have studied the regulations of the various countries, and in the main I, and I think quite a number of my colleagues, have come to the conclusion that the existing and the immediately contemplated standards as laid down by the British Government make an excellent minimum. During the course of the discussion, members on our side will be putting forward certain suggestions.

I should like here and now to pay my tribute to the Surveyors' Department of the Ministry of War Transport for all that they have done and for all that they have tried to do. At the beginning of the war I, and, to their credit, many of the British owners, fought to get regulations introduced which aimed at accomplishing what I mentioned just now, to give our seamen at least a chance of surviving the bestial acts committed in contravention of all the usages of war (which themselves are bestial enough) which the Germans and Italians, and now the Japanese, have been practising. I feel sure that the owners will not allow the question of cost to militate against the immediate introduction if possible of anything designed for that purpose.

The suggestions referred to by Mr. Jarman were as follows:

1. All vessels should be required to carry at least one motor boat on each side and to provide a reserve of fuel, suitably stored, in the other boats for the use of such motor boats.
2. The radial type of davit should be abolished forthwith and all new tonnage be fitted with davits mechanically operated for the purpose of swinging lifeboats outboard.
3. Adequate visibility of the lifeboat compass should be ensured by the use of luminous compass-cards or by effective illumination.
4. Every lifeboat should be fitted with signal pistol equipment.
5. Every lifeboat should carry a waterproof chart, or alternatively a chart in a waterproof container, for use in the vicinity in which a ship is sailing.
6. Definite and adequate arrangements should be made for the position of an abandoned ship to be communicated to those in charge of boats.
7. Ships calling at ports where it is possible to procure liquids such as tomato juice, cans of vegetables and particularly

vegetables with much liquid matter that will provide additional water as well as nutriment, should be required to take on such supplies for use in the lifeboats.

8. Supplies of fresh water in buoyant containers should be carried on board ship in close proximity to the lifeboats and arranged so that they will readily float free of the ship.

9. On tankers carrying inflammables all lifeboats should be of steel and life-rafts should be carried aft in the ship.

10. Nails should not be used in the construction of wooden life-rafts.

11. Fire and boat drills should be held and all life-saving appliances inspected before a vessel leaves a dock or jetty outward bound.

12. One officer should be specifically in charge of guns and arms under the authority of the master. Defence personnel should be supplementary to the normal ship's complement.

13. Expert consideration should be given to the advisability of equipping lifeboats with radio transmission sets capable of transmitting on short-wave as well as on 600 metres.

14. The I.L.O. should collect and circulate information concerning safety measures prescribed by the various maritime countries. Special inspectors should be appointed by Governments to inspect safety conditions and general conditions on board ship.

15. Every navigating and engineer officer in charge of a watch on a vessel's departure from port should have had eight hours' off-duty immediately prior to taking watch.

16. The Commission is not satisfied that the best hull form and weather protection has been designed for ships' lifeboats, and recommends expeditious investigation of these matters.

17. As a wartime safety measure, it is desirable that the Convention on hours and manning be ratified by the Governments of all maritime countries.

To these were added, during the course of the sitting:

18. Every lifeboat should be provided with a unit type first-aid kit in a weather-tight metal container.

19. Pumps, particularly main circulating pumps, which discharge above the light load line, are to be fitted with remote control valves for shutting them down. These controls are to be located adjacent to the remote control for the main engine.

Captain COOMBS: I should like to associate myself with Mr. Jarman's tribute both to the Office and to the various Ministries who have devoted themselves so effectively to this important

question of safety at sea. For my own part, I, and I believe everybody else in this room, attend this meeting in order to assist in promoting the safety of seamen and to further the war effort. It seems to me that to-day effort other than for the promotion of the successful prosecution of the war is effort which is better exerted at another time. . .

I think that the all-important point in safety is the type of boat and raft in which the safety appliances are in the main placed; and it will be noticed that in one of these points, No. 16, the workers' side suggest that they are not convinced that the very best type of hull form for ships' lifeboats has been provided. We suggest that there are designs in existence which are worthy of closer study and ultimate introduction. It is well known among seamen that the average ship's lifeboat is extremely unhandy in a sea-way, and its sailing capacity to windward is very limited. Of course, we know that the balance has to be held between capacity to carry men and passengers and manœuvrability and sea-kindliness; but we feel that it is possible to introduce a design of hull form for boats in which there would be little or no sacrifice of carrying capacity but a considerable increase in sailing ability.

Point No. 2 deals with davits. I think that all who have had experience at sea know that the old type of radial davit is absolutely out of date, and is a menace in attempting to launch ships' lifeboats in heavy weather, particularly if there is a considerable list. We know that the problem of launching ships' lifeboats has not been solved, and probably never will be solved; it is an emergency requirement, and in my own view a perfect solution will never be found; but we do feel that something very much better than the old radial davit has been on the market for many years and is being introduced on most modern ships, and therefore we urge that the radial type of davit should no longer be fitted on new tonnage, and that wherever possible it should be replaced by the mechanical lever type.

With reference to point No. 5, according to the Office report it would seem that the United States Government is the only one which has laid it down that a chart shall be placed aboard every lifeboat. One of the British organisations has taken the precaution of supplying to its members waterproof charts. We suggest that there should be a small-scale chart which should be waterproof or (following the American practice) in a waterproof container. We prefer the former, because after one sea over an ordinary chart it is likely to be reduced to pulp.

Related to that, we suggest in No. 6 that effective arrangements should be made so that the position of a ship about to be abandoned

should be notified, by some system on board ship, to those likely to be placed in charge of the ship's lifeboats. It has been represented to me by a number of British officers that they have not known where the ship was when she was lost. Obviously the ship's movements have to be kept secret on board, but there should be a procedure by which from time to time an approximate ship's position is given to those who have to take charge of the ship's lifeboats.

In point No. 15 we suggest as a safety measure that every navigating and engineer officer in charge of a watch on a vessel's departure from port should have had eight hours off duty immediately prior to taking watch. It may be that some of the seamen's representatives may feel that the same should apply to the quartermaster who is going to the wheel and to the man on the look-out. It seems obvious to us that it is no use to put all this clever and expensive equipment and safety gear in a ship if that ship is likely in any way to be imperilled owing to the fact that the officers on watch go there as tired men after exhausting duties and responsibilities and hard work in port. This is not a new principle; it is one which is already in existence and was, in a number of well-operated companies, applied even before the war. We submit that it is a purely commonsense suggestion, which we hope will have the full support of the shipowners' side of this Commission.

Those are the points in which the officers have a particular interest, but I can assure you that all the members on the workers' side are fully in agreement with the points about which I have spoken, and the officers among the workers' group are equally in agreement with the other points which have been put forward by the seamen's as distinct from the officers' side of the workers' group.

Mr. CURRAN: We of the American delegation are attending for the first time these sessions of the Commission under the auspices of the I.L.O., and we appreciate the fact that the I.L.O. is able to continue this very valuable work, which should be expanded.

The items before us are specifically simple, and items which we believe that all can agree are absolutely imperative. For example, take No. 1. Each and every one of us knows that it is impossible in most cases to launch boats from both sides of the ship, and it often happens that the one side from which boats can be launched is not the side which has a motor boat on it. We suggest, therefore, as an immediate step to increase the safety of seamen, to whom we have paid tribute, a motor boat on each side. We think that that is certainly a necessary move, and one which should find agreement without very much study.

With regard to No. 2, everybody knows the defects of the old type of davit. One end of the boat has to be moved out before the other end can be moved out, and valuable time is lost, and there is tremendous difficulty in holding that boat against any list of the ship, because there is no mechanical help to hold it out there. That should be done away with in all future construction.

With regard to lifeboat compasses, No. 3, we have discovered that the lighting facilities of the compass, after being left in a lifeboat for a long period, are such that the old type is no use at all. In my country in most cases we do have the illuminated card, except in the older type. In the new compasses luminous cards are provided, thereby making it very simple to read the compass even in the darkest of weather.

No. 7 deals with procuring liquids such as tomato juice, vegetables with liquid content, and so on. I believe that most companies are doing that now, and certainly we should be able to agree to that in principle.

Above all, I do not think there is anyone on this Commission who believes in these days, during the war, that the question of cost should enter into the question of life-saving, or should interfere with any contribution which we can make towards the saving of life.

With regard to No. 8, which deals with the provision of fresh water in containers, we make that suggestion because it has been found on some ships where extra containers, about three-quarters full, have been placed close to the lifeboats, that when the lifeboats have been launched these cans are thrown into the water, either on lines or even left to float, and they can be picked up and thereby add to the water supply in the boats. It has been found in many lifeboats that are adrift for a period of ten to fifteen days that they run extremely short of water in a very short time, and this is therefore a suggestion which may be helpful in saving a great many lives.

There are other points here on which other members of our group will speak, but there is one in particular which I should like to mention. We have a great deal of difficulty in our various countries in obtaining information on the step-by-step progress which is being made in safety conditions and other matters of that type, and we subscribe, therefore, to the idea that the International Labour Office should be in a position to obtain the information as to progress made from the various countries, and then that information can be given in pamphlet form, so as to be obtainable in all countries, and thus build up a standardisation of this progress in the best manner possible.

The point about fire and boat drill, No. 11, is one in which we are particularly interested in the United States. It has been the custom in many cases where ships have been rapidly loaded and there has been need for them to leave as rapidly as possible for no lifeboat or fire drill to be held before leaving port. We put this proposal forward because when a ship is in port it usually takes on a crew of men who are not familiar in most cases with the crew's stations, the lifeboats and gear on that ship; and, once the ship clears port, it may be only a matter of minutes before she is attacked, and the confusion which results from lack of knowledge as to the stations on such a ship often leads to more loss of life than would take place had the crew been drilled before the ship left the dock. It takes only a few minutes to carry out this drill, and therefore we say that every ship should have fire and lifeboat drill before leaving dock, even to the extent of lowering boats into the water, and at the same time there should be an inspection of the gear and of the lifeboats. We believe that that would save a great many lives. . .

At this point the Commission adjourned for an hour to enable the shipowners' members to consider the proposals submitted by the seamen's members.

(On the resumption of the sitting, the shipowners' members announced that they were resolved to do all that was practically possible to ensure the safety of crews and entirely agreed with the seamen's group that "the question of cost could not be put up against the question of life-saving". They intimated that they were prepared to accept, either as they stood or with only slight drafting changes, Points 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 13, 14, 16 and 18. On Point 11, the shipowners' representatives accepted the principle but suggested that it should be re-worded, taking into account the British rule on the matter, of which the following version was read¹:

Drills by the crews of all ships are to be held at intervals of not more than one week for exercising the crew in the practical use of the life-saving and fire appliances of the ship and in the procedure for abandoning ship. Such drills should also be held before the ship leaves her port of departure, unless the master is reasonably satisfied that the whole crew has received by means of previous drills held in that ship proper training in the use of the appliances. The master may, subject to the same condition, dispense with the fire drill while the ship is in convoy.

The master shall enter or cause to be entered in the official

¹ For the text of the rule now in force as given in Statutory Rules and Orders, 1942, No. 1519, 32 (3), see p. 93.

log book a statement, or if there is no official log book, cause a record to be kept, of every occasion on which a drill in accordance with this rule is held on board the ship.

The following account of the discussion deals with those points on which there was not immediate agreement.)

Mr. SNEDDEN: There is another series of points which we think involve a considerable number of technical considerations, and we suggest that, without saying whether we approve of them or not, they should be referred to the Governments for immediate consideration. What we suggest as a preamble to the points which I am going to enumerate now is this:

The Joint Maritime Commission, representing shipowners and seafarers, asks the International Labour Organisation, in view of the technical and nautical aspects involved, to refer the following war safety proposals to the Governments concerned for serious and immediate consideration.

The points which we list under that are Nos. 1, 7, 8 and 19.

Then there are three points with which we do not agree, although in some cases we agree with the idea underlying them. These are Nos. 12, 15 and 17. With regard to No. 12, some of us feel that the master's authority must not be infringed in any way; in other countries the practice is for the defence equipment to be under the control of the naval or military authorities completely.

With regard to No. 15, we all agree that where practicable officers should get a rest before they have to go on watch, but we do not think it is a matter on which we can lay down regulations.

With regard to No. 17, we do not feel that this is really a wartime safety measure at all, and therefore we cannot agree to it. I have no doubt that the question of the ratification of this Convention will be raised on the Report of the Acting Director or at some later stage, but we are not prepared to deal with it as a question coming under wartime safety.

I hope that the other side of the Commission will agree that we have gone a long way to meet them, and we really have got a good deal of work done this morning.

Mr. JARMAN: We agree that you have gone some way, but I thought that you would come a considerable distance with us. We shall certainly take advantage of the Report of the Acting Director to raise No. 17.

The point is well taken with regard to No. 12. We discussed that the other day with the naval and military authorities, and

it was felt there—and in fact I said so there—that we could not stand for divided control. All that we then tried to do was to prevent if we could, by agreement, the use of the defence personnel of the ship in the working of the ship. That is, I understand, what was proposed, and we set out to see that the defence personnel of the ship should be under the control of someone who was answerable only to the master of the ship.

Captain COOMBS: We do not want No. 17 to go by default, because we do regard it as a safety matter. I take it that we have the assurance of the shipowners that they will raise no objection to it being discussed on the Report, if it is not discussed during the present sitting.

Mr. SNEDDEN: We are quite prepared to debate this on the Report of the Acting Director.

Mr. HUDIG: I do not understand the argument on No. 11 about the British rule. What is wrong with the British rule?

Mr. JARMAN: These rules have been in operation for a number of years. I happen to have served at sea, and I do not remember a single instance when I was asked or compelled to take part in fire drill. In many ships which I joined I did not even know my station when I returned from the voyage; and that, I think, is the position to-day. The point is that you have men joining the ship, and within a few minutes of leaving port they may be "up against it". It is to see that these men are acquainted with something which may save the ship, let alone save their lives, that we want to see some regulation which will compel steps to be taken to ensure that the crew know their stations on the ship.

Mr. HUDIG: But is it something wrong with the rules, or some lack of discipline on the part of the captain? I thought that with the British regulations, which have been taken over by the Netherlands, we were quite safe. If the captain does not comply with them, he is wrong. Is the wording of the regulation defective, or is it that the captain does not apply it?

Mr. JARMAN: There is a lack of inspection facilities. There is no-one there to compel the captain to see that it is carried out. Some owners inspect the log books to see that it is done, but all owners do not do that, and all inspectors do not carry out their job, as we tried to show in the enquiry into the loss of the *Blairgowrie*, where the inspector told us in open court that he just looked from the quay across to the ship to see that everything was all right, and he thought that it was,

Captain COOMBS: Our point is that the British regulations allow a discretion to the captain which the captain would prefer not to have. Particularly in wartime, when a ship is about to sail there are many things that a captain *must* do, and naturally the things he has a discretion in are the things which are left undone; but if the obligation is put on the captain to see that there is boat drill, and it is not left to his discretion, it relieves the master of a very difficult decision. At the present time, as I say, he has so many things to do which he is under an obligation to do that he is naturally inclined to put on one side the things which he may do but is not compelled to do.

Mr. HUDIG: Thank you. We shall all agree that it is absolutely necessary that the captain should do it.

Captain COOMBS: But do not blame the captain!

Mr. HUDIG: I do not think it is the wording of the rule but a certain lack of control which is at fault.

The CHAIRMAN: That seems to be a point upon which a definite statement should be made.

Mr. CURRAN: I do not believe that, especially in wartime, there should be any question with regard to discretion or any loophole which permits a ship to leave port without holding boat and fire drill.

Mr. HUDIG: We agree.

Mr. CURRAN: This regulation leaves a loophole, because it leaves it to the master's discretion. We have had experience of this. We have shipping companies which are working post-haste to get the ships out, and the master uses the excuse of that post-haste not to have fire and boat drill and see that the men know their stations. There should be no such haste as to prevent station drill, or the inspection of a ship before she leaves port. The cargo is inspected and the engine-room, so why not the lifeboat equipment and fire drill and so on? I do not think that it should be discretionary; I think it should be compulsory.

Mr. HUDIG: We agree.

Captain COOMBS: The captain at present has a discretion which he should not have.

Mr. HUDIG: Now we understand the point, which is that the captain has a discretion, and that discretion should not be allowed. I think we all agree on that.

Third Sitting, 27 June 1942

(In the interval between sittings the secretariat of the Commission prepared the following draft of a resolution, in which Appendix I gave the points on which agreement had been reached between the two groups and Appendix II those on which full agreement had not been reached but which the shipowners' group agreed should be referred to Governments for immediate consideration. The Commission proceeded to discuss whether any of the points in Appendix II should be transferred to Appendix I, and further considered the remaining points on which no agreement had been reached.)

PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON SAFETY

The Joint Maritime Commission,

Having examined the measures now in force in a number of countries for the protection of seamen against the dangers to which they are exposed in time of war, and having noted with satisfaction the great progress made as a result of the war in devising effective safety measures,

Expresses its conviction that the paramount consideration should in all cases be the safety of the seamen and that considerations of expense should not be allowed to be a barrier to the adoption of the most effective measures of protection.

The Commission further considers that every effort should be made to secure the adoption by all maritime countries of the safety measures which experience has shown to be practicable and effective.

The Commission therefore requests the International Labour Office:

- (1) To communicate to Governments as soon as possible, on the basis of the existing practice in the countries having the widest experience in this matter and of the suggestions for further improvements set out in Appendix I to this Resolution, which have been approved by the Commission, a summary statement of the life-saving measures best calculated to protect merchant seamen in time of war and to urge them to review and revise their existing regulations on the matter in the light of the information thus given in order that a high and reasonably uniform standard of safety may be ensured for all seamen;
- (2) To communicate also to Governments the proposals set out in Appendix II of this Resolution for serious and immediate consideration.

APPENDIX I

*Old
number*

- (2) 1. The use of the radial type of davit should be discontinued at the earliest practicable opportunity and all new tonnage should be fitted with davits mechanically operated for the purpose of swinging lifeboats outboard.
- (3) 2. Adequate visibility of the lifeboat compass should be ensured by the use of luminous compass-cards or by effective illumination.
- (4) 3. Every lifeboat should be provided with signal pistol equipment.
- (5) 4. Every lifeboat should carry a waterproof chart, or alternatively a chart in a waterproof container, for use in the vicinity in which the ship is sailing.
- (6) 5. Definite and adequate arrangements should be made for the position of an abandoned ship to be communicated to those in charge of boats.
- (9) 6. On tankers carrying inflammables all lifeboats should be of steel and some life-rafts should be carried aft in the ship.
- (10) 7. Nails should not be used in the construction of wooden life-rafts.
- (13) 8. Expert consideration should be given to the advisability of equipping lifeboats with radio transmission sets capable of transmitting on short-wave as well as on 600 metres.
- (14) 9. Special inspectors should be appointed by Governments to inspect safety conditions and general conditions on board ship.
- (16) 10. Expeditious investigation should be made into the design of the best hull form and weather protection for lifeboats.
- (18) 11. Every lifeboat should be provided with a unit type first-aid kit in a weather-tight metal container.

APPENDIX II

- (1) 1. All vessels should be required to carry at least one motor boat on each side and to provide a reserve of fuel, suitably stored, in the other boats for the use of such motor boats.
- (7) 2. Ships calling at ports where it is possible to procure liquids such as tomato juice, cans of vegetables and particularly vegetables with much liquid matter that will

*Old
number*

provide additional water as well as nutriment, should be required to take on such supplies for use in the life-boats.

- (8) 3. Supplies of fresh water in buoyant containers should be carried on board ship in close proximity to the life-boats and arranged so that they will readily float free of the ship.
- (19) 4. Pumps, particularly main circulating pumps, which discharge above the light load line, are to be fitted with remote control valves for shutting them down. These controls are to be located adjacent to the remote control for the main engine.

Point No. (1) 1.

Mr. JARMAN: I propose that the first point in Appendix II be transferred to Appendix I. I can see no reason at all why that suggestion, which by the British regulations is compulsory in the case of tankers, should not be compulsory in the case of all vessels, which are liable to just the same dangers, with the exception, perhaps, of floating oil.

Mr. HUDIG: I think that there is some misunderstanding. None of us in the meeting this morning said that this proposal for two motor boats should not be accepted, but it is possible that if our technical men and your technical men came together they would find that the whole thing is impracticable and cannot be worked. Personally, I have had discussions with my own technical men and captains about these two motor boats, and I find that they disagree with one another on the point. Can you expect us to accept your argument when we know that there is a considerable difference of opinion on the subject? We have not said "We will not have it; we will not do it", but what we do say is, "Let us be practical, and let us ask our Governments to nominate a committee to work in co-operation with us to study and decide what is the most practicable solution". If we do that, then we shall get something which can be carried out in practice. We should urge our Governments to give that consideration to the matter as quickly as possible. You know and we know that if the practical men come together a solution will be found, but you cannot very well expect us, knowing that there is such an immense difference of opinion, both from a nautical point

of view and from a technical point of view, to decide here and now to agree.

This point says "All vessels". It is to apply to all ships. There are small ships, coastal ships. Some ships can have two motor boats, and in fact do have them; others cannot. The whole question whether to have two motor boats or not, and whether a better solution cannot be found, is a very difficult one, and I think that it is extremely reasonable to say "Let us ask the Governments to sit down, if possible next week, and discuss this suggestion of yours and see whether it cannot be carried out in practice".

There is no lack of co-operation. We both want to see life-saving appliances made as perfect as they can be made, but let us try to do work which will be practical, and not give a definite decision here on a problem about which we know that technical and nautical men differ very much. Let us therefore ask our Governments to go thoroughly into this matter and see what can be carried out in practice. That is our whole idea.

Captain COOMBS: I would remind you that the structure of the Commission does permit the shipowners to have technical advisers. We on our side have the necessary technical advisers. If the shipowners have not technical advisers here, I do not think it is a reason for delaying things.

Mr. ERULKAR: I think that I ought to make my position clear, in view of what we have heard from the other side. The other side have a certain objection to referring certain questions to Governments for examination in the light of practical difficulties in their execution. We meet under difficult conditions and the necessary facilities for obtaining information and data are not readily available. I have not the benefit of having any technical adviser with me. I have not even the benefit of having been able to consult my principals in India with regard to the particular questions which are before us. In those circumstances my participation becomes difficult, especially in view of the objection which seems to be raised to referring certain questions to the Governments for further examination. We wish to go as far as we can, but there are certain practical difficulties in the way which we hope the seamen's group will appreciate.

I wish to take this opportunity of making a reservation with regard to my own participation. That participation must be subject to the reservation which I have made, namely the practical difficulties from which I suffer in the way of technical information and advice and consultation.

Mr. CURRAN: Is it not possible, recognising the difficulties that

exist, to preface these items with words to the effect that the Commission as a whole believes that they can be done, or believes in them in fundamental principle? The words set down here are non-committal, and merely urge consideration of them. If the Commission could say "We believe that these things can and should be done, but of course the technical details will have to be worked out by Governments and technical staffs", it would be something. In this resolution we do not put any pressure behind these items, and I should like to see pressure put behind them. We should at least let the Governments know that this Commission believes that these things can be done. I may be wrong, but I think that at least that much weight should be given to them.

Mr. ANDERSON: Speaking for this side, I believe I can say that we do *not* believe that these things can be done; if we did, we would put them in Appendix I. Appendix II contains things which we should very much like to have done, but we do not believe that they can be done throughout. There must be further discussion; we must not put up a half-baked proposal that every ship in the Allied fleets must do so-and-so. We can say that we should welcome everything in Appendix II, and we encourage as strongly as we can pressing for the things in Appendix II, but we do not think they can all be done in the case of every ship.

Mr. WEISBERGER: We on this side think that they are essential and would save many lives by adding to the chance of men surviving bombing or torpedoing, and therefore we want them put in Appendix I.

Mr. JARMAN: Our position is this, that in the legislation of some countries these things have been found to be possible and are actually in effect.

Mr. SNEDDEN: Without going into any technicalities at all, I should like to ask one simple question. Does anybody on either side of the Commission believe that *all* vessels can carry two motor boats? Obviously the smaller coastal vessels cannot. If we put up this sort of thing as a hard and fast rule when we know that it cannot be carried out, is not that a pity? We know that there will have to be exceptions; is it not better to say so now?

In the draft preamble which we put forward we said that technical questions were involved, and for that reason we referred these questions to the Governments. When the Governments get down to it they will consult both the seamen's representatives and the shipowners' representatives; but we do not want to put something forward which on the face of it cannot be carried out. We all know

that the word "all" in paragraph 1 of Appendix II simply will not work.

Mr. OLDENBROEK: I had the impression that the Joint Maritime Commission was a technical body to advise the Governments, and that it was not for the Commission to appeal to the Governments to advise it. It is possible that this Commission is not wholly in a position to give technical advice, but at least I think we can muster sufficient experts here to do so, if we wish.

I do not think that this should be a question between shipowners and seamen. I can quite understand it being one group against the other if the question concerns working hours and wages, but not when it concerns safety. Are the shipowners now going to say "Because there are certain ships in which it is not possible to carry two motor lifeboats, we are against this", or are they going to say "Will you make an exception for small coastal ships, which cannot carry more than one"? This last would be their duty; they should not reject this and make it impossible for us to come to a joint agreement.

Captain COOMBS: I would remind the Commission that according to the Office booklet "The War and Merchant Seamen, II" Norway appears to have found it possible to put at least one motor boat on every ship. Admittedly below a certain tonnage it can be an outboard motor, but that is not excluded by our suggestion.

Mr. JARMAN: I cannot see the force of the shipowners' argument, because you can get away only from one side of a ship, and if it is logical to carry one it is possible to carry two. I appreciate the point made about the question of the size of the ship, but I took the word "all" from the British regulations with regard to oil tankers. It is laid down there that a tanker of whatever size must carry two motor lifeboats, one on each side of the ship.

Mr. CURRAN: Mr. Snedden said he was concerned about the small boats, but putting this in Appendix II in effect leaves it out altogether.

Mr. TUDEHOPE: If the shipowners think that a line should be drawn, why do not they suggest it as a counter-proposal, and then we should be prepared to consider it.

Mr. CURRAN: The last time Mr. Snedden rose he pointed out that difficulties would arise in the case of small boats. That leaves most of the proposition intact. Why, then, does not he propose something which would take care of that situation, but which would still leave the principle of the proposition intact?

Mr. SNEDDEN: I can answer that in three plain words: I don't know. I do not know what the snags are in this proposition. I have put one forward. We have not, with the utmost respect to Mr. Colin Anderson, all the technical people here. There will be other difficulties. Other difficulties were put forward at the group meeting. This is a technical question, and we suggest that the sensible thing is to put this, with the authority of the Commission, to the Governments, and ask them to deal with it quickly. I still think that that is the right way to deal with it.

Captain COOMBS: All these matters are technical, but on the points in Appendix I the shipowners seem quite prepared to put their amateur view forward without technical support, while they are equally anxious that their amateur view without technical support should be reserved in the case of the recommendations in Appendix II. It does not seem to me to fit in.

Mr. HUDIG: Let me try again. There is very great willingness to do what is practicable and possible to ensure what we all want, the greatest safety for the men on board, but we find, in studying your wording, that we get into any amount of trouble. First we have the Atlantic trade; then we have the coastal trade and the island trade, the West Indian trade and the West African trade; there are the coasters, the semi-coasters and the small ships generally. We have to bear in mind that if there are to be two motor boats, one on each side, the capacity of these as far as the numbers they will carry are concerned is reduced, and more room will have to be provided in the other boats.

You have our full support in trying to achieve your aim, because we feel that if we have one duty it is to see to the safety of our men. We need not repeat that any more. But in any suggestions which we make, do let us be practical. Someone said "Have not you any technical staff?" I have an extremely clever technical man here. He tells us that everybody even among our own staff differs about the idea, even the captains who are responsible for the safety of their men. Mr. Curran says we should agree in principle and say that this has our sympathy. Of course it has our sympathy, and if practical means can be found to do what you wish, then it should be done. But do not let us decide here in a hurry what can be done and how it can be done.

Mr. CLEWS: It should be made clear that the four points contained in Appendix II are not objected to at all by the shipowners, but we feel that the provisions suggested should be referred to the Governments concerned.

Mr. CURRAN: Is it the purpose of this Commission to ask for the advice of Governments, or to give some advice to Governments? If the first, then any one of us can submit a question to the Governments and wait for an answer; but I believe that the Governments are in need of advice and information on these problems, and that this Commission should advise the Governments, and not the Governments advise this Commission.

Mr. SNEDDEN: Mr. Curran's point was that he wanted us to express some view about the points set out in Appendix II. We suggest that we do express a view, and that we amend paragraph (2) of the preamble, which deals with Appendix II, to read:

To communicate also to Governments the proposals set out in Appendix II of this Resolution, the adoption of the principles of which they would welcome, for serious and immediate consideration as to their practicability.

Mr. CURRAN: I submit that the only thing you have done is to add words.

Mr. JARMAN: Could we say that there should be two motor boats on board all vessels engaged in overseas trade? Would the shipowners go that far to meet us, leaving the question of smaller vessels to the technical advisers?

Captain COOMBS: I should like to put forward a personal suggestion, on which I have not had an opportunity of consulting my colleagues. It is that paragraph (2) should read:

To communicate also to Governments the proposals (which require further technical consideration) set out in Appendix II for immediate consideration and action.

Mr. WEISBERGER: That is giving it back to the Governments.

Mr. SNEDDEN: Unless that is ruled out as just adding words, I think that it meets our view.

Mr. CURRAN: I agree that all the different types of small boats do raise a problem, but you will find in all the rules and regulations governing shipping that we deal with the question of tonnage. There may be something to be said in the case of small boats, but in the case of the larger ships on the overseas trade and the larger coastal vessels, which have a complement of four lifeboats in most cases, the position is different, and I do not see why we should

not discuss the proposition that vessels over a certain tonnage should carry two motor boats.

Mr. JARMAN: A simpler solution would be to refer the whole thing to the Governments, and they will reject the suggestions which are on technical grounds not found to be practicable.

The CHAIRMAN: I take it that the position of the seamen's side is that they want these to be definite proposals, to be carried out wherever they are technically practicable.

Mr. CURRAN: We do not use the words "technically practicable". We have examined the technique, and we believe that they can be carried out, and therefore we say that they should be done now. Certainly the technical experts of the Governments will throw them out if they are impossible, but if we leave a loophole as wide as that one no decision will ever be made, because of the division of opinion among technical experts, who often, we find, are not too technically expert because of lack of practical knowledge. Therefore the proposal drops, and is never even tested. If that had been done, we should never have had any of our inventions, because they have often been called technically impracticable; but look at them to-day!

Mr. TUDEHOPE: I suggest to the shipowners that they should indicate to us how low they are prepared to come in tonnage in the matter of ships which must carry one motor boat on each side; if they will do that, I do not think that there will be great difficulty in coming to an agreement. Let us try to draw a line and say that from a certain tonnage upward ships must carry a motor lifeboat on each side, so that the men who are involved in these disasters, from whichever side they are attacked, will have some opportunity of lowering a motor boat, which will enable them to take the other boats in tow and have a possible chance of reaching safety.

There is quite enough technical knowledge among the shipowners to enable them to come to an agreement to-day, knowing the number of lifeboats carried on a ship, and to enable them to say that from such-and-such a tonnage upward it should be laid down that ships must have one motor boat on each side. If a proposal of that sort comes from their side, we will give it immediate and favourable consideration.

Mr. SNEDDEN: We have had a variety of suggestions. I suggest that we leave this point and go through the others. There may be others on which we shall be asked to give the view of the shipowners.

Point No. (7) 2.

Mr. ANDERSON: Lifeboats at the moment have as much of a job as they can do to carry the men and the essentials for the men. Do we really want to put forward a suggestion that we should add damp vegetables to their complement? You can give the men the nutriment they want much better without it being damp; you can give it in a concentrated form. You can give them the liquid that they want far better in the form of water. I have spoken to experts about this and have taken a great deal of trouble about it, and their advice has always been: "You are wasting your time putting on delicacies, when there is all too little room for the essentials—water and concentrated foods".

Mr. JARMAN: We too appreciate that there is no sense in loading the boat so that there is no room for the men at all, but that is not the intention. This is put forward seriously, after serious investigation of the cases of thousands of men who have come back and told us their experiences. It has not been put down lightly, but because we believe it to be the best possible way of sustaining life and giving a man a better chance.

Mr. CURRAN: This was put in to some extent on the recommendation of the delegates from the United States. We find in the United States that there can be additions of canned liquid vegetables, the liquid of which has often preserved a life, apart from its food value. We are hard-headed, practical men. We do not have the benefit of a great deal of theoretical knowledge, but we do know what is required, and we do have at heart the interests of the men who are making these voyages; and we put forward these suggestions as a result of extreme experiences on the part of these men, which is something that you do not get at a desk or in a laboratory. That is why these suggestions are here. We put in "where it is possible" because we felt that at some ports it would be impossible to procure them; but we felt that ships going to countries where they could be obtained should obtain them. It has definitely saved lives.

The CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that in this case there is a real conflict of view, and it would be much better for this to be stated in the record of our proceedings as the view of the seamen, with the observations of the shipowners upon it. But there is obviously a point to be considered here. If a ship is under the obligation to take in cans of vegetables at ports where they can be procured, then space must be provided for them, even though

occupy that space. That is the way in which it strikes me. This is an obligation which you are putting on them.

Mr. CURRAN: There is space in lifeboats, for example, under the thwarts, which often is not fully utilised. You would be amazed at the amount of stuff which can be packed in that space, which is otherwise quite unusable except for reckoning as cubic space when calculating how much room is available per person carried. A good deal of stuff can be packed away there which will not be in the way of the movement of people in the boat. We have also to consider the consumption of the articles in the boat; after a few days, many of the articles are cast adrift, and there is more space left. Overcrowding of boats when they are launched is a bad practice in the first place, but we have had that happen in many cases.

The CHAIRMAN: As I have listened to the argument, the difference here is that you wish the obligation to be to procure tomato juice or cans of vegetables and so on when the ship calls at ports where they can be procured, whereas I understand the other side to say that if there is space available—which would include the space to which you have just referred—it would be better to use it for water.

It boils down to the fact that the maximum amount of water or moisture should be provided in the boat. This would place an obligation on the master of the ship actually to put these things in when he could buy them.

Mr. CURRAN: We have found the value of this on American ships. We have had men come in on lifeboats who have been out a long time—in one case, as long as 31 days—and they said they got moisture out of some canned stuff, and if they had not had it they would have died. There have been several other cases of the same kind—we are talking about a wartime set-up. We know that there are certain things which are not practicable in peacetime, but these men, on the basis of their experience, make the recommendation that if it is at all possible we ought to try to carry this out, and, if not in the form of tomato juice, let us say water; but we ought to try to provide what as the result of their experience they found to be lacking. . .

Tomato juice and so-called luxuries seem to be looked on with a certain lack of interest, and the suggestion has been made that it would be better to have extra canisters of water. All right; we have no quarrel with that. We ask for liquid which would help the water supply, and if it is water, all right; but some such thing

should be added in the boats. After ten days in most boats the water has gone, because there is never enough water in a boat to take care of the people in it, or else something happens to it. I think that the Commission is wasting its time if it even suggests technical advice on the question of extra water for a lifeboat.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no difference of view on that; it is a question of what to put in the record to express exactly the view that you want to express and to see that it is considered.

Mr. SNEDDEN: I think both sides are in agreement that something should be added, but we suggest water and more concentrated food. If you leave it to us, we can have something on the record.

Point No. (8) 3.

Mr. CURRAN: I should like to relate the experience of one man who found himself alone, and close to him was a raft. He managed to get on the raft, and then from the wreckage of two other rafts he supplied himself with a great amount of food. He then picked out a davenport and put that on, and he found a piece of canvas, and he was comfortable for thirty days until he was picked up. That man, by obtaining these extra supplies, was able to carry on all alone. All that wreckage was floating about. Every ship has a great deal of moveable matter that floats, and a canister half or three-quarters full of water would also float. Secondly, a long coil of line could be attached to the can and to the lifeboat, so as not to interfere with its movements when it struck the water. We believe that this idea is perfectly practicable. A round can does not take up any room placed next to the lifeboats, in such a position that it would float free or could be thrown over. Water is the handiest thing in the world, and no means of supplying it should be neglected. It is a life-giving medium.

Mr. SNEDDEN: Now we have heard Mr. Curran's explanation, we see that this is linked up with the previous point, and we will take them both back with us.

Point No. (19) 4.

Mr. WEISBERGER: It has been brought up at various times that some boats have been lost when they were launched because of the overflow. This is a requirement on American ships, and we feel that it would be a good requirement for all ships. It is required for all ships under the American flag.

Mr. SNEDDEN: I think we are taking everything back, and we will take that one back to consider.

Mr. CURRAN: We are referring to the great overflow from the condensers and various exhausts. Often when lifeboats are released down the side of a ship, before you can release them and they can get away they are swamped by this tremendous overflow. If there was a control such as is suggested to shut that down when the time came to launch the lifeboats, that would be a tremendous help, and it might save a great many lives.

Mr. HUDIG: It can be done.

Commander LEE: Would you accept that for new construction only? It is universally done for new construction.

Mr. CURRAN: It would have to apply mostly to new construction, because to tear ships apart now to put in these controls would be difficult. We say that we should like to see it applied to all ships, but it should be done on new construction at least.

Commander LEE: I think it generally is on new ships.

Mr. HUDIG: And it has been done on some of the old construction.

Commander LEE: It is principally the main overboard discharge with which you are concerned?

Mr. CURRAN: There are others where we should like it done also.

Point No. 11.¹

Captain COOMBS: I think that one of the difficulties which everyone has experienced both on board ship and in Government departments responsible for putting the safety equipment on board is that members of the crew are frequently not familiar with the gear which is put on board for their own safety. It is no use putting excellently-designed and well-made material on board a ship unless the men on board are thoroughly familiar with its use. We suggest that if there should be more time in port which is utilised in thoroughly instructing the men, it will be doing a great service towards ensuring maximum safety at sea under war conditions. I know that the difficulty of masters and officers is that in the rush of business in port to-day, with the man-power which they have, it is almost impossible in many ships to give the necessary instruction, or even to familiarise the men with the gear which is put on board. I think that on enquiry you will find that that is the experience of those whose business it is to investigate what happens when there is a war casualty. There should be no difficulty about this matter. The majority of the nations, I think, have pools working now, and

¹ See above, pp. 72, 76-79.

it should be possible to send reliefs down, in order that there may be time for the men to be instructed in this safety gear.

Mr. CURRAN: Our argument on this point is that all loopholes should be removed. As things stand, you still have the discretion of the master. The British rule reads:

One such drill shall be held before the ship leaves her port of departure or before reaching the open sea on proceeding from such port, except in the case where the Master is reasonably satisfied that the whole crew has received, by means of previous drills held in that ship, proper training in the use of the life-saving appliances and the procedure for abandoning ship.

I do not believe that the words "reasonably satisfied" should be left in. There is always some turnover in a ship, and the master may say "There are two or three men on this ship who know the lifeboat drill, and there are only five new ones on board"; but just where would those five men go if called to stations? In all probability they would run to somebody else's station, and would stumble over each other. It should be cut and dried that there must be fire and boat drill before the ship leaves port. It can be done; there is no ship sailing which cannot have that before she leaves.

Mr. HUDIG: It can be done, yes.

Mr. CURRAN: That being so, we disagree very definitely with any suggestion of leaving this out.

Commander LEE: As I understand the proposal, it is when the crew is first put on board; you want the drill before she leaves on the first leg of her voyage?

Mr. CURRAN: Yes, and after that there will be the regular drills.

Commander LEE: I do not see why we should not do that; it is good practice.

Mr. CURRAN: In American boats we have drills regularly, and sometimes every day; but it should be done before the ship leaves port. Some of our ships have not been out an hour before being attacked. In the case of one or two ships, so few were saved that we do not know whether there was any confusion.

Commander LEE: The way it was put up, it looked as though every time a ship left port she had to have a drill. If this is properly re-worded, there should be no difficulty in accepting it. . .

Mr. CURRAN: The first port of departure, and where a change of crew is made, or whenever changes in crew are made.

Commander LEE: Important changes. You do not mean one man.

Mr. CURRAN: I mean important changes. That would take care of the coastwise ship. That is my view.

Mr. BÉCU: In re-wording the text, we should insist on the words "and all life-saving appliances inspected" before the ship sails, and that means, in our opinion, especially the lifeboats; because on several ships the lifeboats have never been lowered into the water or tested, and if it is doubtful, on inspection, whether the lifeboats are in proper shape to be lowered into the sea, it should be done before the ship sails.

Mr. TUDEHOPE: It was made clear that this boat drill and fire drill is only to take place at the commencement of the voyage, but the rest of the clause remains as it is.

The CHAIRMAN: You do not want the life-saving appliances inspected when there is a substantial change in the crew?

Captain COOMBS: That is a different point. When a ship goes into port there may be no changes in the crew, but equipment may be stolen from the lifeboats, and I think that the equipment should be inspected.

Commander LEE: In every port? We will not stand for that.

Mr. CURRAN: I am primarily interested in the wording being left as it is for the first port of departure. We are primarily interested in the inspection of lifeboats and safety appliances being undertaken at the first port of departure.

Commander LEE: That is the responsibility of the Government despatching that ship.

Mr. TUDEHOPE: If the wording is altered to make that addition, the remainder of the clause remains.

Mr. CURRAN: We have an example of a ship, which we will not name, where when a boat was raised the bottom fell out of it. That is one example of lack of inspection. The only thing holding the bottom together was paint, and part of the bottom actually fell out. That sort of thing would be done away with if proper inspection was made.

Mr. HUDIG: That will be looked into.

*Point No. 12.*¹

Commander LEE: We have on our ships an armed guard which is completely military, and under the control of the military. So far as the defence of that ship is concerned, the captain must follow the judgment of the trained military man. We do not propose to go away from that position.

Captain COOMBS: I ask only for information, but does that mean that for the manoeuvring of the ship, which is an important part of defence, the captain is under the instruction of a military man?

Commander LEE: Not necessarily the manoeuvring; that is usually under the instructions of the convoy commander, and in any event it is to avoid danger; but the firing of the guns and the control of the guns and when they start to fire and cease to fire and the control of the military crew—all that is entirely under the command of the naval officer on board, and we will not change that position.

Mr. CURRAN: It is possible that with a little more explanation we can agree with the way you express it. What happens on some ships, as I understand it, is that there has been an interchange of crews. We quite agree that the military crew should have full charge of the gun and its maintenance, but on some ships there has been, as we understand it, an interchange of those crews. Sometimes a member of the ordinary crew is called on to watch by the gun, and sometimes members of the gun's crew do some work about the ship. But I think the master is in full command of his vessel at all times, according to our law.

Commander LEE: The military crew have nothing to do with the working of the ship at all.

Mr. CURRAN: We want that to be a definitely separate arrangement. At no time should the military part of the crew take over the operations of the merchant crew, nor the merchant crew take over the operations of the military.

Commander LEE: They take it over only for the defence of the ship itself.

Mr. CURRAN: Unless in an emergency.

Commander LEE: Defence is always an emergency.

Mr. CURRAN: I should not call a member of the gun crew peeling potatoes an emergency. That has happened on some ships.

¹ See above, pp. 72, 77.

We want a dividing line between what is a military operation and what is a merchant ship operation.

Commander LEE: It does not happen on our ships.

Mr. CURRAN: It may not happen on the Moore-McCormack Lines.

Commander LEE: It will not happen on any of our ships, because I am now in control of the armed crews, and I can assure you they will not peel potatoes.

Mr. CURRAN: We understand that in some cases they check cargo when in port and watch cargo when in port. That does not seem to me to be part of their business, which is the maintenance and handling of the guns and defence operations in an emergency. The watching and checking of cargo is certainly a merchant ship operation, unless it is a special type of cargo.

Commander LEE: I was going to say that there was only one case where they would assist in the discharging, and that is where a ship is combat loaded. In that case all hands turn out, whether gun crew or not, to get the ship discharged. I do not think you would object to that.

Mr. CURRAN: No, but I am not talking about that; I am talking about the ordinary course of a voyage.

Commander LEE: In the ordinary course of a voyage the armed crew will do their duty, which is defence and nothing else.

Mr. WEISBERGER: That has not been so in the past.

Captain COOMBS: I think that I ought to put it on record that as far as British masters are concerned, when it comes to fighting their ship they insist on being in command for defence purposes, and the manoeuvring of the ship, and not only the fighting of the guns, plays an important part in the defence of the ship—for instance, getting the ship right with regard to sun, light, clouds and so on.

As I understand No. 12, it means that where the merchant personnel are responsible for the upkeep of the armament, then one of the merchant officers should be specifically in charge of the guns and armament. That would not cut across the American practice. In the majority of Allied ships, merchant officers are responsible for the efficient maintenance of the guns and have the gun crews under them, and the idea of this is that where they are responsible, one officer should be specifically nominated for responsibility under the master.

Mr. JARMAN: The British Government left the British seaman to fight his own ship, because they could not supply us with personnel. We had one man put on board the ship, and then two, and then we find in certain cases they are in a position to put on three naval ratings and two military, in charge of a petty officer gunlayer, who has only the authority of a petty officer. I understand that in America an ensign or someone like that is put on board ship in charge of a military party, and the only responsibility of the master of the ship is to see that he carries on. My concern is not to convey the impression that we want to remove from the merchant seamen of this country, at any rate, the right to fight their own ships. That is not our intention, because most of our men are now trained as gunners and would not thank me for suggesting that they should have on board ship sufficient military personnel to fight the ship for them. What we want to say is that in the first instance, where it is possible, sufficient armed men should be put on board ship to run the gun.

Mr. CURRAN: We too suggested the training of merchant seamen for the handling of the guns, and that point was rejected. We had got the notion from the British seamen that their ships were being so handled, and, because we have about 20 per cent. of former naval seamen among the merchant crews, we felt that that would be of assistance in allowing the military forces to be utilised in other fields than that of gun crews on ships. I do not think, however, that Mr. Lee meant to allow the record to show that the gunnery officer who is placed on board an American ship is responsible for the manoeuvring of the vessel. I do not think that he meant to leave that impression.

Commander LEE: What I want to put on record is that my country believes it is competent to decide how a ship shall be handled for military purposes, and we are not content to accept advice on that score.

Mr. CURRAN: I am going to agree with you, because I come from there; but I raise the point because I should not like the impression to be left that a 20-year old ensign is operating a big merchant vessel. I think he uses the advice of the master in moving that big ship sometimes.

Captain COOMBS: Is it not quite clear that nobody here, of course, is attempting to indicate how merchant ships should be defended? All we say is that where they are defended by merchant crews, one officer should be responsible. We go no further than saying that where the system is such that a merchant officer is

in charge of the armament, then there should be one specifically told off for the purpose.

Commander LEE: I regard the entire article as not within the province of this organisation at all. I think it is something with which we have no business to deal at all. If you have difficulty in the British merchant marine, I do not think that you should pull the rest of us in to straighten that out. I think that this thing should be dropped. It is a matter of military principle, and we are sorry, but we cannot give way on it at all.

Mr. CURRAN: I should be the last to agree that any other Government should dictate to our country how its military forces should operate and its ships be defended; I think it is quite competent, and has proved itself to be quite competent, to deal with that. The question which is raised is that this is a Commission created for the purpose of making better safety conditions and making recommendations to Governments to increase safety on merchant ships and so on, and therefore I think that it is quite within the scope of this Commission to recommend that in the case of ships where merchant crews are utilised for gun crews, one officer should be in charge.

Commander LEE: Suppose the British want two officers?

Mr. CURRAN: That is the difficulty to-day; I think that there are four or five officers in charge.

Commander LEE: That is their business, not ours. I still think that that is the province of the military and naval authorities, and not of our Commission.

Mr. CURRAN: Even when merchant crews are used?

Commander LEE: Certainly.

Mr. BÉCU: Cannot we agree on the second part of this article, "Defence personnel should be supplementary to the normal ship's complement"? We have had on several of our ships men doing other work, and we think it is a question of safety that the men put on board a ship to man the gun should be supplementary to the ordinary crew. If the men are not on the gun, they may not be able to act swiftly enough to attack a submarine, and so we want them to be supplementary to the crew, so that they may keep watch and watch on their gun.

Mr. JARMAN: This does not happen in British ships, but it does happen in Belgian ships, and I think also, though I am not

sure, in Dutch ships, where there are no military personnel of any description, but the crew is left to fight the ship. That is what we are trying to get at.

Mr. OLDENBROEK: That is the case with several countries, and, if there is danger, the number of the crew is absolutely insufficient. That is the point. We are not trying to tell the American Government that the defence personnel should be supplementary to the normal ship's complement, because that is already the case with them, so that there is no need for us to tell them.

The CHAIRMAN: This is largely a matter between Governments.

Mr. BÉCU: And it is a question of the safety of the ship and of the crew.

Mr. TUDEHOPE: It is largely a matter of divided control in time of emergency, such as when a ship is attacked. We say clearly that in cases where this situation does exist, then there should be only one control over the merchant crew, and that is the officer of the ship. In Commander Lee's ships he has made it very plain that that question does not arise; but it does operate here, and we think that it is a very serious handicap in dealing with an emergency. If you have men handling a gun, and you find a military officer ordering a merchant seaman about when the merchant officer wants him to do something else, where do you get? I think that this is a serious matter, which requires the serious attention of the Commission as a whole, which should come to a decision and make a recommendation in the form suggested in the amendment put forward by Captain Coombs.

Mr. SNEDDEN: I think that we should be well advised to leave this whole article alone. Take the first sentence. It is quite obvious that we are speaking of different methods of defending ships according to our countries. Mr. Jarman is correct when he says that we had to begin by defending our ships entirely with merchant navy personnel. We are in a much better position now than we used to be, but the point we have always made is that the master must be in supreme control, and nothing will alter our view on that. The Americans have a different view, and therefore it is obvious that the Commission cannot come to a conclusion on that, and we should be well advised to leave it alone.

Most of our larger ships do have merchant navy officers in charge of armament. Some of them do nothing else but look after the armament. In some cases the master has delegated his authority to a specific officer, but that does not apply in all ships, and I do not think you can lay it down.

With regard to the suggestion that defence personnel should be supplementary to the normal ship's complement, we were not clear what that meant. If it means that naval or military ratings should be supplementary, we should of course agree to that, but if it means that a merchant seaman gunner must have nothing to do except look after the gun, or if it means that the new category of mercantile machine-gunner must be additional to the crew and have nothing else to do, in the first place we have not the men, and secondly we have not the accommodation, and, frankly, I do not believe that the average seaman in that position would want to have nothing to do with the ordinary ship's duties. I do not think that that is what this means, but it is a possible interpretation. We use the term "defence personnel" in two ways.

However, this is a subject which I think that we should be well advised to leave alone. We have had a fair discussion, and we know the different points of view. They will be given in the record. I suggest that we should leave this to be dealt with with our respective Governments.

Captain COOMBS: It is a question of being in charge of the maintenance of the guns; that is the point. In the second sentence, I think "defence personnel" means personnel supplied by the military or naval authorities. I think that that clarifies those two points, and I would remind you of the proviso "Where the armament is in charge of merchant navy personnel". The point is, "Where the armament is in charge of merchant navy personnel, one officer should be specifically in charge of maintenance of guns and arms". That covers the point.

The CHAIRMAN: Apparently it is impossible to get a united view on the shipowners' side, and the only possibility seems to me to be to record this discussion, and, if you think it desirable, you can have this put down as the view of the seamen's side.

Mr. JARMAN: I think that in view of the explanation which is on the record now we have got what we wanted, and we may get further by dealing with our own Governments, and therefore we shall not press this.

Point No. 15.¹

Captain COOMBS: The principle of this point is already in force in some companies, and it is hardly necessary to stress that, for the safety of the ship and the men, those in charge of the ship should be alert and fresh and thoroughly fit when they leave port. I am asked to say from the seamen's side that they wish to include

¹ See above, pp. 72, 74, 77.

the quartermaster and the look-out man taking the trick immediately on leaving port.

Mr. TUDEHOPE: In Australia the officers have for years had certain periods off in their ships, and a certain amount in their home ports and a number of periods in their out ports. Previously it was two periods of 24 hours, with three periods of 24 hours in the out ports. That was found to be of great benefit to the officers of the ship. Recently legislation in Australia has provided for a 44-hour week for seamen. That has had the effect of increasing the number of leisure periods for officers and engineers, who are now given three periods of 24 hours off per month in the home port and four periods of 24 hours in the out ports. It has had the effect also of extending it to the ratings. Where the 44-hour period has been applied now to seamen on ships on the Australian register, the seamen in Australia have a day and a half off per week. That has been the method by which the equivalent of the 44-hour week can be granted to the seamen.

It was felt in Australia that, particularly in wartime, the strain and stress of voyages are such, although they are nothing like as bad as in the case of Britain and America, that the men needed relaxation in order efficiently to carry out their duties. The Government was approached, and the result was that by the introduction of what are known in Australia as "standard hours" for the shipping industry the objective for which the organisations were striving, more leisure, was achieved. Not only have the officers increased their rest and leave but the seamen also have a certain amount of leave granted to them per week, which is given to them at the end of each voyage.

One particular company in Australia goes further than that. Realising the great necessity of giving men relief from their arduous duties on board ship, and of giving them the opportunity of spending some time with their family, they practically put the whole crew off the ship every time the ship reaches its home port, and they engage a limited number of officers and men who are required to carry on the ordinary running of the ship.

We believe in Australia that a reform of that sort is absolutely essential for officers and ratings on board ship; and it has been proved since the operation of this 44-hour week, which came into operation on 2 January, that the benefit to the officers and ratings has been of great value.

I strongly support, therefore, the proposal which Captain Coombs has made. If it can be done, as is shown to be the case by our experience in Australia, some attempt should be made by

the shipowners to give this much needed relief not only to officers but to other ratings on board ship. It may be arranged as a result of negotiations between the shipowners and the seamen's organisations. The proposal here affects only the officers, but we find in Australia that its application to the whole crew is of great benefit, not only in the actual running of the ship but from a social point of view. It is of great value to the ship, and the men have the opportunity of being away from each other for a period; and we know that if men are associated together for a long period they get tired of one another, and that does not make for harmony on board ship.

Mr. SNEDDEN: I have only to repeat what I said at the morning sitting. No-one will disagree with the purpose of this. What Mr. Tudehope said is quite different from this proposal. We all agree that officers and ratings should if possible be off duty before the ship sails; it is very desirable, and it is only common sense; it is ridiculous to send tired men to sea. But that is different from laying down a hard and fast rule that in all cases there must be this eight hours off duty. I do not think that anyone could guarantee that. We certainly agree that the principle is sound, that officers and men should go to sea fresh, but that is a different matter from accepting this wording.

Captain COOMBS: Has Mr. Snedden any suggestion to make? Let me put this to him: if an officer or man has been working by his ship for eight hours before the ship sails, does he go to sea fresh?

Mr. CURRAN: As I understand this, there is agreement on the proposition that both officers and men should be given rest time before going to sea—both officers and men, because it is not only the officers that get tired. I think, therefore, that we should be able to arrive at some wording which would take care of that matter, so that this entire clause is not lost.

Mr. SNEDDEN: That is my personal view, and I think that we can get some form of words, but we cannot lay it down that it must happen in every case. That would not be sensible; it would mean that ships would not be able to go to sea in some cases.

Mr. JARMAN: We can perhaps agree on something.

Mr. HAUGEN: We in Norway have a clause saying that the master has to see to it that the members of the crew who take over the first watch after the departure from port have had a sufficient rest period, and I do not think that we have had any case where that has not been done.

Mr. BÉCU: I understand that as far as the ratings are concerned this is applied on our European ships, but not for the officers. I have known cases of officers who have worked for twelve hours until midnight, and the ship has sailed at 5 a.m., and they have had to take watch on the bridge and in the engineroom. Usually it concerns only one officer from the deck and one from the engineroom. Why should not those two officers be given eight hours free before the ship sails?

The CHAIRMAN: As I understand it, the shipowners' side agree with you in principle; it is only a question of finding words to meet some cases which they have in mind.

Captain COOMBS: I hope they will be able to find words a little more specific than "sufficient".

*Point No. 17.*¹

Captain COOMBS: I should like strongly to express the hope that the Commission will be able to reach an agreement on No. 17, and I again ask the shipowners to reconsider their attitude. I should like to emphasise that this is essentially a safety matter, and we are approaching it—and I feel sure that they will accept our word on this—on the grounds of wartime safety and efficiency.

Our experience—and I speak now in particular as representing a British officers' organisation—is that one thing which is causing the greatest concern among ships' officers at sea to-day is the question of hours. It is not too much to say that men are getting discouraged; they say, "When are we going to have some regulation of hours in wartime, so that we can go to sea thoroughly fit and fresh to face the perils which we are likely to meet?". Pay, leave and other matters we do not hear about: it is hours all the time.

I think the shipowners will agree that there has been no question of seafarers or officers seeking to exploit the war situation. Those whom I represent are concerned with winning the war as quickly as possible, and we think of what will happen after the war only in so far as it affects our efficiency to-day. We are hoping, of course, that many of the things obtained as wartime measures will be stabilised after the war, and that is why we include "ratification" in the wording of No. 17, because it is one of the things that are disturbing men's minds that even now there is no move towards ratification; but as a wartime measure, if it is not thought possible to urge ratification, as I am sure it is, is not it possible for both sides to meet and to come to some wartime agreement, if nothing more definite can be decided on?

¹ See above, pp. 72, 77, 78.

A request has been put forward from the international officers' organisation to meet the Allied shipowners on the question of hours, but I am sorry to say that we have not yet heard that they are prepared to meet us. We greatly hope that they will. Is it not possible now, after the arguments that I have put forward, for shipowners to agree that the regulation of hours and manning is a wartime safety measure, and to support a recommendation put forward by this Commission, that the attention of the Governments of the various countries should be drawn to this (I hope) agreed decision that the question of hours should be considered promptly and something done?

Mr. JARMAN: At some time or some place during this Session I am certainly going to ask for, or demand if necessary, the ratification of the Geneva Convention on hours. In this clause we try to place it in a safety category, because we believe that that undoubtedly is partly, at any rate, where it belongs. There is nothing more than that in it at the moment. We believe that long hours and insufficient rest make a man less capable not only of safeguarding himself but of safeguarding the ship as well. I do not place it any higher than that. If we cannot get any further with it now, we shall certainly raise it on the Report of the Acting Director.

The CHAIRMAN: You wish it to be recorded really that, apart altogether from the rest of the discussion, you regard this as a safety measure?

Mr. JARMAN: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: That will be placed on record.

Additional Clauses.

Mr. OLDENBROEK: There are two other matters which we think should be included in the resolution. We think that this resolution should also state that the I.L.O. should continue its study of safety measures, in order that it may be ready at a later stage to elaborate an international Convention on safety measures for seamen. That is one point.

The second point is that once the I.L.O. has worked out the summary referred to in paragraph (1) of the preamble to this resolution and has sent it to the Governments, we should like to suggest to the Governments how the inspection of safety material is to be worked internationally; that is to say, that we expect the Governments to make reciprocal agreements whereby they undertake to inspect not only their own ships but also ships of other

countries which enter their ports. I think that that is entirely in agreement with existing practice so far as international safety regulations in the mercantile marine are concerned, and especially as far as wireless telegraphy is concerned. As Captain Coombs points out to me, it is also the case with regard to the Load Line Convention.

Mr. JARMAN: We intend to take a further step. If once we come to that conclusion, we suggest that both sides should pledge themselves to move the Government to implement what we have suggested in the immediate interests of safety.

Mr. SNEDDEN: What is the proposal? First of all, that the I.L.O. should carry on its studies of safety measures, so that this matter can eventually be put down for a Maritime Session of the Conference?

Mr. JARMAN: Yes.

Mr. SNEDDEN: Secondly, to make suggestions about how safety appliances are to be inspected, and recommend that there be reciprocal agreements to accept national inspection: is that it?

Mr. OLDENBROEK: The second point is the international inspection of ships. That means that we do not only have the inspection of lifeboats in the ports of the country to which the ship belongs, but also in the ports of other countries, and that we get reciprocal agreements between the different Governments in order to make that possible.

Mr. HUDIG: For safety purposes?

Mr. OLDENBROEK: Yes.

Mr. CURRAN: I should like to give you one example. We had a vessel in a South American port where the crew demanded of the authorities there that something should be done, and demonstrated to them that one of the lifeboats had a hole in it, and a very big one; but the authorities in that port did nothing whatever about the boat, and the ship's crew stood in danger of being arrested for refusing to sail the vessel. That boat went out. We took pictures of the lifeboat and had all the necessary details. That is something which should be prevented, and that is one of the things that is aimed at; there are many more, of course.

The CHAIRMAN: The suggestion is that the Commission recommend to the Office that this item should be put down for consideration at a Maritime Conference?

Mr. OLDENBROEK: No. The first point is for a future International Labour Conference, but this should be part of our recommendation to the Governments.

Captain COOMBS: To be brought into force as quickly as possible, for safety purposes during the war.

Mr. DAHL-HANSEN: Is it the intention that the Norwegians and the British and the United States authorities shall effect this inspection? Will not it be enough if the Norwegians do it? Otherwise it will be done two or three times over.

Mr. CURRAN: How do you overcome the fact that a vessel leaves a port where an inspection takes place which is only superficial and, when it gets to a port where there is no inspection, we have no opportunity for having an inspection in that other port, even when something is wrong? We believe that that should be overcome if we have the interest of the safety of the men at heart.

Mr. DAHL-HANSEN: Yes, but you do not want to make it double or three times.

Mr. OLDENBROEK: If you have a Norwegian representative, there is no need to call in the British or Americans to do the same thing.

(After an adjournment of the Commission for group consultations, the shipowners' members proposed the deletion of Appendix II from the resolution, and with it clause 2 of the preamble, and the inclusion of four additional points with the others in the sole Appendix: these points are given as Nos. 1, 3, 12 and 13 in the final text. These proposals were accepted by the seamen's members. In regard to Point 1, it was intimated that the Greek shipowners would have to make a reservation; they had not yet had an opportunity of consulting the other national interests involved and in the case of the Greek mercantile marine the proposal would involve a fundamental change.

The seamen's representatives proposed the addition of two new clauses to the resolution. These, which appear as clauses (2) and (3) of the final text, were agreed to by the shipowners' representatives.

The shipowners' representatives suggested that the question of rest before going on watch should be dealt with in a separate resolution, as it was not the concern of Governments. The text of the resolution appears as No. II of the resolutions on safety measures given in Part III. This resolution was agreed upon by the two groups, Mr. Haugen making the reservation that reasonable rest should be given in peacetime as well as in wartime.)

Seventh Sitting, 29 June 1942

(At this sitting the seamen's representatives submitted the resolution of which the text is given as No. III in Part III and which was adopted by the Commission without amendment.)

Mr. TUDEHOPE: In moving this resolution, I should like to say briefly that the seamen's group appreciate the fact that some little time must elapse before the decisions of the Commission, particularly in regard to safety, are given effect to, but we are anxious that no unnecessary or undue delay should take place in these matters, and particularly those in which the shipowners are directly interested. For instance, there are quite a number of matters included in the proposal which the seamen's group put forward with regard to safety, and to which the shipowners agreed, which we feel could be put into operation and given effect to with very little delay. We do not want to find ourselves in the position that this Commission arrives at decisions, and some six or twelve months later we find such things as a signal pistol or a waterproof chart or something else drifting into the lifeboats. We suggest to the shipowners that, as we have decided unanimously that no question of expense shall be a barrier to the operation of the improvements which we suggest in regard to safety, so also that should apply as far as the expeditious handling of any matter which is contained in our proposals is concerned.

We suggest to the shipowners that they should take a look at these proposals and get to work and find out what they can deal with directly themselves, without any reference at all to the Government of any particular country. There are quite a number of items there which are the concern of the shipowners themselves, and we think that it would be a fine gesture to the seamen if, within a very short though reasonable period of the rising of this Commission, the seamen found some of these improvements which we have suggested being included in the lifeboat equipment of the ships of the various countries.

There is no need to dwell at any great length on this. It is the desire of the seamen's group that prompt action should be taken by the shipowners, and I feel sure that, in view of their sincerity in the carrying of these resolutions, they will do their best to implement the suggestions put forward. We earnestly appeal to the shipowners to set to work within a reasonable time after the Commission rises and find out to which of these proposals they can give immediate effect, and, if they find that there are quite a number of these proposals which can be included in the equipment on

board ship, we suggest that there should be no undue delay in having them added to the present equipment.

Mr. JARMAN: I formally second.

Mr. SNEDDEN: We were a little puzzled when we got this resolution, because we thought that it might be read as meaning that having passed the resolution on the first day we were not going to have those proposals carried out; but Mr. Tudehope has explained quite clearly what he means, and we have no objection at all to this resolution. Having adopted these proposals, we certainly want to have them carried out as soon as possible.

Eighth Sitting, 30 June 1942

(At this sitting the Commission adopted unanimously and without further discussion the three resolutions on safety, in the form given in Part III.)

Engine Room Complements.

(In connection with the discussion on safety, Captain Coombs asked that it be put on record that the British engineer officers considered it desirable for reasons of safety that all sea-going vessels should carry the necessary complement in the engine room department so as to ensure the constant attendance of the engineer-officer on watch at his place of duty at the engine-control position.)

Welfare

Fourth Sitting, 28 June 1942

The SECRETARY: The Commission has before it, as material for this discussion, four documents. First of all, there is the article on "Organisation for Seamen's Welfare in Great Britain"¹, which is largely concerned with the machinery set up by the British Government in pursuance of the Recommendation adopted by the Conference in 1936. The results of the operation of that machinery are set out in the memorandum prepared specially for the information of the Commission by the Welfare Department of the Ministry of Labour and National Service.² Then there is a description of the machinery and of the results achieved in Canada, based on information supplied by the Director of Merchant Seamen of the Dominion, given in the printed document "The War and Merchant

¹ *International Labour Review*, Vol. XLIII, No. 4, April 1941.

² This document has not been published.

Seamen, III".¹ Finally, there is a one-page roneoed document², which gives some official information on this subject from Australia, Chile, Mexico and the Union of South Africa, together with one or two other fragments of information. The official information, I may explain, was received in reply to an enquiry made of Governments by the Office over a year ago.

The information before the Commission is very far from being adequate. The Office had hoped to publish in time for this Session of the Commission, and still hopes to publish quite shortly, an account of the admirable work which is being done for Norwegian seamen, including the provision of clubs, reading rooms, hostels, rest and convalescent homes, educational courses and technical training courses. I regret very much that it has not been possible to provide that information for the Commission in roneoed form, but no doubt Mr. Dahl-Hansen and Mr. Haugen will be able to give the Commission all the information they need on Norwegian activities.

Another noticeable omission is the absence of any information relating to the United States, but there again Commander Lee, Mr. Curran and Mr. Weisberger will be able to give us information, particularly, perhaps, on the educational and recreational work which the unions themselves have organised there.

But, even if the information before the Commission is not as adequate as we should like it to be, there is, I think, enough to show that the Recommendation adopted by the Conference in 1936 has provided a very sound foundation on which to build. Nevertheless, I think it is true that the building has so far been limited to a very few countries, and much still remains to be done.

The war, of course, has given an enormous impetus to welfare work for merchant seamen, and the work now done may prove to be the starting point of effective organisation which will continue after the war. On the other hand, there is perhaps a risk that when the war ends and the emotions aroused by the war take some other form, there may be some falling off of activity. The Commission, I think, will wish first of all to exchange information on what is being done in the various countries, and perhaps some proposals may be made for the development in the future of this very necessary work for the welfare of seamen whilst ashore.

MR. DAHL-HANSEN: I will tell you what has been done in Norway in this regard. Welfare arrangements for Norwegian seamen ashore have, in the prevailing circumstances, naturally had the closest attention of the Norwegian Shipping and Trade

¹ *International Labour Review*, Vol. XLVI, No. 1, July 1942.

² This document has not been published.

Mission, of our Government, and of the seamen's associations. In co-operation, a large number of social enterprises has been carried out, mainly in the United Kingdom and America, but also in other parts of the world. As the seamen are cut off from their people at home and exposed to great mental and physical strain, it is recognised by all how absolutely essential it is that welfare should be dealt with most efficiently. A considerable part of the revenue accruing from the mercantile marine is used for this purpose, in order to provide a satisfactory solution for this important problem. This has been done with very good results.

A number of seamen's hostels, reading rooms and seamen's clubs have been established, in addition to those which already existed. An endeavour has been made to make these, as far as the sites, furnishing and food are concerned, as hygienic and comfortable as possible. Moreover, there have been established Norwegian hospitals and convalescent and rest homes under the management of prominent Norwegian doctors, assisted by Norwegian nurses. In the larger ports there have been established Norwegian medical offices and medicine depots, which also carry out inspection of the hygienic conditions on board the ships. The Norwegian Seamen's Mission and the Norwegian Red Cross also carry out very good work in this connection.

The new rules and regulations which recently came into force with regard to Norwegian seamen's health insurance are a great social improvement. The most important of these is the regulation providing for the refund of all necessary expenses incurred during illness, which secures for the seamen free medical treatment and maintenance for a period of up to one year. Another important improvement is that the seamen, according to the new regulations, are covered by the health insurance until one month after discharge.

Of particular importance is the work carried out by the Norwegian Information Office under the leadership of the Prime Minister, Mr. Nygaardsvold. Its task is to distribute news and information of interest to the seamen. Here in the United Kingdom the Information Office has a department which arranges for lectures and talks in Norwegian and English, as well as for artistic entertainment, and many prominent men and women are attached to the Office. This is an enterprise which the seamen appreciate. Under this office comes also the *Norsk Tidend*, a Norwegian newspaper which is published twice a week and sent to the seamen.

Schools for the education of navigators, engineers and wireless operators have been established in the United Kingdom, as well as in America.

In London and New York the Norwegian Seamen's Savings and Contributions Offices were established as early as 1940. These offices take care of the seamen's financial interests; and, when it is remembered that we went into the fight against the Germans in 1940 with about 30,000 seamen, the necessity for these offices will be readily understood. According to the agreement with the seamen's associations, *Nortraship* pay monthly into each seaman's personal account 10 per cent. of his gross earnings, plus an amount of about £3. The large amounts administered by the Savings and Contributions Offices will be greatly welcomed by the families of the seamen, who during the war have been missing so much, when the seamen return.

It would take too long to go into detail here about all the social enterprises which have been carried out since that disastrous day when we were driven out of our country. Mutual misfortune has, however, brought us together as never before in a way which without doubt will be a mighty advantage when we, after the Nazi curse has been removed, not only re-establish but improve the old democracy of Norway.

In all our endeavours to improve the welfare arrangements for our seamen ashore, we have from the very beginning met with exceptional friendliness from the British authorities and from private individuals. To a large extent it has only been by availing ourselves of this goodwill and willing assistance that it has been possible for us to go as far as we have. I should also like to take this opportunity to express our gratitude towards the United States for their co-operation and assistance in this matter.

Mr. JARMAN: It is refreshing and encouraging that there should be this approach to the welfare of seamen from the angle which has been adopted now. Hitherto it seems to me that the approach to seamen's welfare has been based upon the dictum of an ancient Italian philosopher that seamen were "nearer to death and further from God" than any other section of the community. It has always annoyed me that that should be the approach. It seems to me, however, that at long last the question is now being approached from the angle that they are human beings with human needs, and possibly with human frailties too.

Mr. BOWDEN: Although this Recommendation on welfare was passed by a unanimous vote in 1936, very little was done in respect of it until war broke out and compelled action to be taken. Something has since been done, but not, I think, enough, or anything like enough, because there are still very many ports in the world

where there are inadequate welfare services. I think, however, that we can look with very great satisfaction on the advance which has been made and is being made. At a later stage we shall move a resolution which will ask that that advance be accelerated and further developed. As a matter of fact, I think the reason why we have been deprived up to the present of a visit from the Minister of Labour is that he has been absent on welfare matters in the North of England. He opened a very fine club in Liverpool yesterday, for which I think the money has principally been subscribed by the shipowners themselves out of their own pockets, a very nice gesture and one that is very encouraging to everyone concerned with this important question.

What I am afraid of, however, is this. There has been a great fillip to welfare due to the war, but it may drop back again as soon as the war ceases. I remember that in 1914-18 we had the same attitude towards welfare; every good lady in the country knitted comforters and socks and all kinds of things for the seamen, but as soon as the armistice was signed they did not care a hang whether the seamen had any socks at all. I am afraid that that position may come about again; and, now that we have this Recommendation, I hope that every maritime country will adopt it and put it into real and effective operation.

On this side of the Commission, we think that there are one or two matters of special importance with regard to welfare. We think that it should be put on a proper and permanent financial basis. I do not know what the position is in other countries, but in our country we have fads. During certain periods, everybody's attention seems to be focused on, say tuberculosis, and the charitable public subscribe large funds for work against tuberculosis; and then suddenly interest in that drops, and work against cancer is taken up. At the moment, of course, any Tom, Dick or Harry can go out and raise money for seamen, though whether all of it gets to the seamen is another matter altogether.

But we do not want seamen's welfare to be dependent upon voluntary contributions. There should be a contribution from the industry and the State in some shape or form, and on a proper and permanent basis. It is deplorable that year after year in our newspapers we see advertisements which do not say so in so many words, but which insinuate that the shipowners are hard-hearted slave-drivers who leave their men in poverty and distress in every port in the country, that the men's unions are absolutely negligent of their welfare interests, that every seaman is an improvident and drunken scoundrel, and that their only hope lies in the good, charitable public putting their hands into their pockets and giving

them a shake-down, a bun, an orange and a cup of tea, or something of that sort.

That sort of "welfare" for seamen may have been all right a hundred and fifty years ago, or even a hundred years ago, but it is not the kind of welfare that is required now. The Recommendation has laid down a basis for decent, progressive and adequate welfare. It will be capable of improvement as experience develops, but surely every maritime country should now translate the debt of the world to the merchant seamen into action by putting this Recommendation swiftly and adequately into operation.

In our resolution we shall call attention to that, and to the question of organisation. We should like to see the organisation of welfare in the hands of the industrial organisations concerned. We hope that Governments will always take a benevolent interest, and perhaps a guiding interest, in all these matters, but we think that the representatives of shipowners and seamen should be really in control of the welfare of seamen, because they are the only people who really understand the whole of their needs.

I have dealt with the question of finance, which I think should be placed on an adequate and permanent basis, and not be dependent on flag days, charitable contributions and that kind of thing. We also think that every country should make special provision for all visiting seamen. The seaman who is in his own country does not need welfare services to anything like the extent that he needs them in ports abroad. I think that every country should see to it that the seamen who visit its ports in the course of their occupation are regarded as welcome visitors who should have everything that is reasonable and proper provided for them, so that they can enjoy with profit and credit to themselves their stay in the country that they are visiting.

Mr. TUDEHOPE: I was present at the Conference in 1936 when this Recommendation on welfare was unanimously adopted. We were all at that time fully alive to the necessity of providing adequate protection for men who were landed in foreign ports, feeling that this question was of a social character and quite apart from the heated arguments that usually arise between employer and employee on industrial matters. We felt that we were at any rate on an even keel with regard to the measures which should be adopted in the various countries for the purpose of protecting seamen who were away from their homes, and in some cases thousands of miles from their homes, in large cities where they found it very difficult to find comfortable and reasonable surroundings.

It was felt by the seamen's delegates at that time that we had

at last arrived at some basis on which a scheme could be introduced in the various countries for the purpose of attending to the requirements of seamen who were placed in the position to which I have referred.

We find, however, that in very many cases the principles laid down in the Recommendation have not been followed; and, as a result, the seaman arriving at one of these ports will find, as he always has found in the past, that a state of confusion exists as to where he should go, to what institution he can go where he can at any rate have a "clean up" and perhaps do a little writing and have a rest and a decent meal. It is often very difficult for someone in a strange country to locate the right café or restaurant where he can secure a meal suitable to his palate.

We feel that the welfare of the seamen should not be left in the hands of individual societies with no status at all, which in very many cases go round the streets with collecting boxes for seamen, with absolutely no control over the handling of their finances. In very many cases what we might term a "racket" is made out of it, and the seaman who approaches such organisations can get no proper satisfaction from them as to what might be required by him. He is subject to all kinds of humiliations from them, and there is no institution to which he can go where he feels that he is not being put under some obligation to the organisation providing it.

Our view is that there should be one centralised control in the respective ports. There should be control of finance by the Government in a proper way, and the seaman arriving at a port should feel that there is a place to which he can go for recreation and so on, and where he will not be under an obligation to anybody, but where he will feel that it is part of a service to which he is justly entitled.

There is also the question of the discrimination which takes place in all ports against the coloured seaman. The coloured seaman is, in our opinion, subject to a great deal of discrimination and unjust treatment in the various ports. No provision is made for his particular ideas, and he, in a strange country, cannot adapt himself to the customs of the European; yet no attempt is made by the Governments or other authorities or by the different societies in the respective countries to do something to meet his requirements from the point of view of religion or mode of living. The result is that we find in Australia, when seamen of this category come to us, that we have great difficulty in making proper provision for them, and we usually have to resort to the consul concerned. In some cases that is satisfactory, but in many cases

it is unsatisfactory, with the result that the seamen of that particular country are at a disadvantage. Some recognition must be given to the seamen of this class, so that, when they arrive at foreign ports where the customs are not in accordance with their mode of living, they can be provided for in accordance with their method of living in their own country. These things appear to be lacking, and we think that attention should be given to them by the Governments of the different countries.

Our principal concern is that the institutions concerned with the welfare of seamen should be removed from all association with charity. A seaman should not feel that in going to them he is accepting charity. We want the seaman to feel, when he goes to one of these places, that he is going to a place which is supported by the Government and not by charitable collections, and that he is going to a place to which he is *entitled* to go.

For that reason, we suggest that the principles laid down in this Recommendation are sound, and will make provision for all the various aspects of welfare that crop up from time to time and that concern the seaman in port; and, if they are unanimously adopted here, as they were by the Conference in 1936, there is no reason at all why immediate effect should not be given to them. We hope that they will be unanimously adopted, and that seamen will be given their rightful place in the community. The seamen are certainly doing a great service; there is no need to stress that, because it is obvious; and, particularly in wartime, we feel that they are entitled to treatment which will place them on an equal footing with other citizens in the community.

Mr. CHU: I wish to say something about the welfare of seamen from the Asiatic countries. Since the time of Pearl Harbour, Asiatic seamen have been unable to return to their own countries, and the question of their welfare is all the more important on that account. I should like, therefore, to call your attention to certain facts.

What is the welfare work which is being done for Asiatic seamen by the Governments and by charitable organisations? I cannot give you an exact account of it, but if you will come to Liverpool I can take you over nine or ten boarding houses which are provided there for Chinese seamen, and in some of them there is not even electricity installed. I do not think that there should be blackout inside the houses as well as outside! The result is that the Chinese seamen have to buy candles for lighting purposes. Some of them are survivors of ships which have been sunk, and they are living in accommodation with no lighting, with no sanitary arrangements and with no sheets; they have to bring their own.

There is another thing which I should like to point out. I believe that no Chinese or Indian seaman is allowed to go to the canteen to get a cup of coffee or tea. I do not know whether this is an example of discrimination or what it means; but I can tell you that welfare provisions for seamen from the Asiatic countries are badly needed. These men are far from their own countries; they have been at sea for some weeks, but when they come ashore they find that no decent living conditions are provided for them. I think that that is an injustice and is inhumane, and therefore I want to support what other speakers have said, that there is great need for special provision for the welfare of seamen from Asiatic countries.

In the Recommendation of 1936, Part VII, Article 13, deals with equality of treatment; but, as Mr. Tudehope has said, since that Recommendation was adopted by the Conference very little has been done. It may be that 13 is an unlucky number, but I think that Article 13 is a very important article, yet nothing has been done about it.

A few days ago Mr. Philip Noel-Baker, the Parliamentary Secretary of the Ministry of War Transport, said: "We cannot thank sufficiently the brave Chinese seamen who keep our ships going on the seas". He also said that many of them have been decorated for bravery, and I think that the bravery of the Chinese seamen has been recognised by the British and Dutch Governments, because most of these seamen are working in British and Dutch ships. I quite appreciate what Mr. Noel-Baker said, but I say frankly that we do not want lip-service; what we want is decent living accommodation and proper, practical welfare measures for the Chinese seamen.

Mr. BÉCU: I should like to make special reference to Part III of the Recommendation of 1936, which deals with health. Here it is stated that: "All suitable measures should be taken to make known to seamen entering the port . . . the dangers and means of preventing diseases".

Never before, in my opinion, has this article of the Recommendation been of such great importance as it is now. It will be known to most of us that cases of contagious disease are growing very seriously, and I believe that all those connected with shipping should be very much concerned about this. Instances could be reported to this Commission where twenty men out of forty on board a ship leaving port were suffering from such a disease. It is a very important matter and a very dangerous matter for Governments, for shipowners and for seamen.

When the question was put to the shipowners why those men were allowed to sail when they were suffering from such a disease, there was only one answer, "Shortage of crew; we must send them out". They said, "There is no other possibility". I feel, however, that if serious measures are not taken disease will spread so rapidly that it will affect the greater percentage of our seamen; because men who have contracted disease are a great danger to their fellow-seamen on board ship. I believe that this Commission should draw the particular attention of the different Governments to this serious question, and I hope that suitable measures will be taken once and for all to avoid the spread of disease.

Mr. RAHUSEN: Mr. Bécu has talked about a very serious matter, and I fully endorse what he said. We are facing a shortage of men, and many of our men are suffering from venereal disease. On the Netherlands Shipping Committee we are doing all we can to combat this disease in the most efficacious manner possible in present circumstances, but I still feel that there is something wrong. When a seaman has contracted the disease he is unable to perform his work. I think, therefore, that we should tackle this subject in a different manner, by dealing with it at its source. I believe that it is at present, under the legislation of this country, not easy to take steps to prevent the seaman coming in contact with those who are already infected. That being the case, I should like to ask whether it is not possible to do something which would make it possible to isolate those women who are already infected, so as to prevent the possibility of seamen coming in contact with them.

Mr. WEISBERGER: Speaking of welfare in the U.S.A., our organisation is of opinion that, as far as welfare is concerned, there is only one body—the unions—that is looking after the welfare of the seamen. Of course, in the United States we have various organisations such as the Seamen's Church Institute, the Salvation Army, the Y.M.C.A. and the Seamen's Friends Society who claim to be helping the seamen. We admit that they are doing a lot of good work, but not for the seamen.

We have had a good deal of experience with many of these outfits. Along the Pacific coast, where we have had several of these societies and charitable organisations making claims that they were helping American seamen, we have been forced to take economic action to close these particular places, and we have been very successful in doing so. We have approached the authorities of the various States and cities who were contributing to these organisations on the strength of their claim that they were helping

the seamen. Not only do we find that these various charitable organisations discriminate against colour and race, but we also find that they discriminate against the American seamen; we have had many cases of seamen who were recuperating from illness being dislodged or put out from these various places, and who have been discharged from hospitals because they could not pay their bill.

We have also found that all these organisations that are supposed to help the seamen have closed their doors to seamen when they found that they could get others into their institutions who would pay more than the American or the foreign seaman can. Recently we have known these institutions to go so far as to fit up their basements or cellars for seamen and use their other floors for coast-guards and others.

I can say that we are greatly in favour of the Recommendation adopted at Geneva in October 1936.

Mr. ALLEY: When the news of this Recommendation of 1936 reached the Indian seamen, they thought that something was going to be done for them in the Indian ports and in the British and other ports at which they call, but nothing has been done by the Government of India or on this side. I should like to thank those in this country who have taken at any rate some steps, although not enough, to remedy the situation, and I would refer in particular to the home for Indian seamen which has been opened in Glasgow. The only activity in India, as far as I know, has been that one seamen's house has been opened by the Viceroy in the port of Calcutta, in January or February of this year.

Reference has already been made to the discrimination on grounds of colour which is practised in this country, and in some ports in America too. I leave it to you to judge whether there should be this discrimination against Indian seamen who, as we think, are doing good service in bringing food and war materials to the countries which are fighting for democracy and freedom in this war, and which were at least claiming to be democratic in their outlook before the war. We consider that when we bring food and other materials to the different countries we are entitled to some consideration, but we find that we are treated as a people apart. When you arrive at any port here, Liverpool or Glasgow or Tilbury or wherever it may be, the first thing you get is an invitation from a mission to come along. I have not seen any mission for miners or railwaymen; it is always for seamen, who, because they bring food to the country, seem to be looked upon as great sinners whose souls must be looked after so as to help them to go to Heaven. That is the impression which we get.

But, leaving that aside, what happens when an Indian crew over here want to be repatriated or transferred to another ship? The shipowners have an agent who is paid a certain amount of money for the maintenance of these scamen, but what he does is not subject to supervision either by the Government or by the shipowners, and so naturally he wants to make a profit out of it. The result is known to you all. I can take you to a place in London where in one room about the size of this in which we are meeting 200 men are expected to sleep. Since the establishment of the Welfare Board in this country there have been certain enquiries at the ports about housing conditions, and as a result there has been a slight change for the better, and that is why I said that I must thank the authorities of this country for taking some interest in the matter.

Pressure should be brought to bear upon the Governments, and particularly on the Indian Government, to do something to improve the present state of affairs. When I refer to the Indian Government, I ought at the same time to make it clear that most of the shipowners concerned are British; 95 per cent. of the Indian seamen who leave Indian ports in ocean-going liners are employed by British shipowners. When the question of finance comes up in the discussion, therefore, I may suggest that it is the responsibility of British shipowners, in conjunction with the Government of India, to see that reciprocal arrangements are made. We do not say that the Indian Government should not do anything for English seamen and the British Government should not do anything for Indian seamen. Something ought to be done, and in a properly organised way, instead of it being left to individuals without supervision or control by anybody. That is why I support the resolution which is going to be placed before the Commission.

Mr. CURRAN: A great deal can be said on this subject of the welfare of seamen, but the basic fact is that seamen have always been considered as being a necessary evil. That is the traditional attitude. It dates back to the old sailing days, when in order to staff a ship it was necessary to "shanghai" ordinary citizens, because of the inability to obtain crews for the ships and for the conditions under which the men had to live. The position has changed as countries and their peoples became more educated, but the seamen seem to be the last to be considered.

I believe we could take up a few days with the discussion of the handling of seamen's welfare in America. Our welfare activities for seamen are divided into three phases. First of all, there are Government activities, and I may say that our Government has taken a great interest in the welfare of seamen so far as hospital

facilities are concerned. Some time ago our Government established throughout the country a number of the most beautiful hospitals that one could hope to see, intended for seamen. I am not sure what the method of finance is. The Government is fully responsible for them, but I believe that the operators in some way or other come into the financing, on the basis of the type of patient who goes in. There are several types of patient. There is the man who is taken ill while ashore, who is taken care of by the Government. In the case of the man who is injured or who is taken ill on ship-board, I believe that the operator has some obligation; possibly Mr. Lee can clear that point up.

That has been a very good phase, but recently the seamen have tended to be moved out of those hospitals and every other type of Government employee has gone in—coastguards and so on. Not that we deny them the right to do so, but we think that there ought to be facilities for such people apart from those provided for the merchant seamen. We do not consider that these hospitals are marine hospitals any longer; they are now hospitals for every type of Government employee. However, that did represent a great step forward. Before that there were some charity hospitals supported by the operators and by charitable organisations, but, because of the way in which they fell down on the job, the Government, as a result of petitions and other methods, brought into being the marine hospitals operated by the Government, which were very good.

Another phase is the charitable seamen's institutes and "seamen's houses", as they are called. So far as they are concerned, our position is, first of all, that we do not want charity. As long as the tradition of keeping the seamen on the waterfront and treating them as illiterate and low-type characters persists, so long there will be a continuance of all kinds of charitable organisations; but we take the view that the seaman is not of that type, but that the seaman to-day is, and has been for a long time past, exactly the same type of person, though possibly not so well educated or so well off, as the shipowner or any other citizen of the country, and therefore he deserves the same treatment as the best of the citizens of the country.

I think that the first thing to do is to get the seamen off the waterfront and stop taking the attitude "We will build institutions to take care of them, but they must be taken care of on the waterfront". I think that the seamen should begin to come up-town, like other human beings. Once that happens, you will find that the need for charity and for all these other things will begin to disappear, and the seamen will be recognised as human beings.

That is another phase of it. We have many of these charitable organisations. As Mr. Weisberger has pointed out, on the Pacific coast these institutes were effectively closed up by the action of the organisations. He did not tell you the reasons for that, but the reasons are very clear. These charitable organisations were kept up on the basis that they did something for the seamen. That, of course, was true in a few situations, but in most situations they were an instrumentality to keep the seamen in a particular place, on the waterfront, and in such an economic status that they would have no influence against any operations of the shipowners or anyone else. Secondly, they were an instrumentality in times of dispute for the recruitment of seamen, the intimidation of seamen and discrimination against seamen. It was because of those factors, and because they did nothing for the seamen, that our organisations on the Pacific coast did their best to close them, and succeeded in closing them down.

The same thing applies to the institutions on the East coast to-day. The seamen's institutes on the East coast house very few seamen. They do, however, house newly-recruited men for the armed forces, and particularly the navy, coastguards and other people; but they house very few seamen, and as a matter of fact very few seamen want to be housed there, because in order to obtain anything they must go through the most humiliating and degrading treatment. The saving of souls, and that sort of thing, is included, and everybody knows about it. The seamen's soul is usually washed a good deal cleaner than are the souls of most people ashore, because salt water is good for the soul!

However, we find to-day, in wartime, a very good situation. People are vitally interested in the welfare of the seamen. They were vitally interested in it in 1936, when a very good Recommendation was adopted by the International Labour Conference; but for some reason or other that Recommendation did not become as effective as it ought to have been.

We believe that these institutes and similar charitable organisations should be done away with completely, and some form of organisation established which will be supported by the Government and the operators; and possibly later on the seamen's organisations will almost be able to take care of their seamen themselves.

A further reason why we should like to see something done about this matter is that we have noticed that at times when the seamen have tried to secure legislation in the various countries, and especially in our own, to better their conditions, these organisations, for some reason or other, have always taken the opposite side to the seamen. They have taken the attitude that the sea-

men were being well treated in these institutes, which was a natural thing, because these institutes provided very good jobs for a parasitic group of people and also provided an instrumentality for keeping seamen in a status which enabled the operators to handle them more easily. That may be a rough word, but it has proved to be true, especially in our country. This sort of thing should be stopped, and the way to do it is by taking a very forceful position with respect to what we think about this type of organisation. This Commission can certainly make it clear that the seamen have come along the road to-day to a point where they are no longer the charity wards which in the old days they had to be, through force of circumstances and not by their own desire. To-day the seaman is an educated man. I believe that 25 to 30 per cent. of the seamen in the United States have gone through grammar school or high school, and 4 to 5 per cent. have gone through college. The sooner we recognise that the seaman is a citizen, the sooner we shall get down to the business of giving him proper treatment.

To sum up, the position that the seamen take is this. We want no charity; on the contrary, we want recognition and equal treatment with all other citizens. So far as the delegation from the United States is concerned, we support fully the recommendations which will be made by the seamen's group.

I do not want to speak at all about the treatment accorded to Chinese and Indian seamen. I think the best way to deal with that is for a delegation of operators and Government representatives to walk into the places provided for Chinese and Indian seamen and have a look at them for themselves. I have seen some of them in the United States, and I know just what the conditions are.

There is, however, one more phase of this situation on which I want to speak, and that is the treatment of seamen on ships; particularly Chinese and Indian seamen, but in some cases all seamen. In some ships, we have not got beyond what was termed the "bucko mate" treatment in the old days. The captain and the mate of the ship are, of course, the supreme commanders of the vessel, but they have in some cases gone beyond what we consider to be the right of any man, and in some cases recently there have been very disastrous consequences as a result of that sort of treatment being accorded to seamen. In some ports I understand that some seamen have been shot by the master of the vessel, and in one port as many as fifteen on one vessel were injured or killed, most of them being killed. That phase of the situation needs a great deal of looking into if we are going to bring the position to the level which it should attain.

Something should be done to consider the establishment of

"rest farms" for seamen. After this war, the nerves and the physical condition of seamen will be upset. I understand that the British seamen's union has gone a long way towards dealing with that situation, and has an estate here in Britain for that purpose. I think that it would be well for all the countries to consider doing something on those lines and providing a place for seamen to go into the country for a time to rest their nerves and become rehabilitated before going back to sea. That should be given consideration when talking about post-war plans for seamen.

The question of the aged seamen is another important phase. We have in the United States an organisation known as "Sailors' Snug Harbour", which is about the richest organisation in the world to-day; it owns all the land that Wall Street is built on, valued at millions of dollars. I shall not go into details about it, but it would be as well if some members of the I.L.O. would look at what a man has to go through to obtain entrance into Sailors' Snug Harbour, because if he gets in before he dies he is lucky; and, if he does get in, the way in which he is treated when he has got in ought to be looked into too. I think that that is a very important phase, because to-day when a seaman gets over 40 years of age there are some companies in the United States who will not employ him. That has been broken down a good deal, and exists only in the case of a few companies now; but we believe that when the war is over it will again come to the forefront a good deal, and the situation regarding aged seamen is as important as the situation regarding Indian and Chinese seamen. They are left to drift after they reach a certain age, and there is no provision to take care of those aged seamen, who have in most cases given brilliant service in their earlier days, and who are still among the best. I think that that is a very important phase of the seamen's welfare problem.

Mr. SNEDDEN: So far as the discussion this morning is concerned, I do not think there is much disagreement; perhaps that is because we are not shooting at each other, but our "Target for To-day" is rather the Governments and the voluntary organisations.

I think that Mr. Mortished and Mr. Bowden were right when, in opening this discussion, they said that welfare had received a wartime impetus, and, so far as we are concerned, we shall do all that we can in this country to see that that impetus is continued, and possibly increased, after the war.

There have been three important aspects of this impetus. The first, I think, is the presence amongst us of a large number of Allied seamen who have been dispossessed of their home country.

The questions affecting them are being dealt with very effectively by the Allied Missions in this country.

The second change has been the general movement of our shipping from the East coast to the West coast. That brought special problems, and in a way it was a great help in dealing with the question of welfare. It is not possible to get new hostels all at once; some attention has to be paid to the existing hostels, set up by the voluntary organisations, many of them in very bad condition and many of them quite unsuitable for modern requirements; and there, where the voluntary organisations themselves have not built new and suitable hostels, we have been able to get Government hostels through the working of the Seamen's Welfare Board. Further, in some ports voluntary organisations which had fought against each other for years did begin to co-operate.

The third change under war conditions was that referred to by Mr. Weisberger. He must not think that the United States is the only country where the coastguards step in and take the best accommodation for themselves, although it was originally provided for merchant seamen. We have had many examples of the same sort of thing in this country, and we have had very great difficulty in getting it put right. I know that there are questions of priority in this matter. . .

Mr. CURRAN: May I interrupt to clear up this point? You are speaking of wartime here, but this was done before the war in the United States.

Mr. SNEDDEN: Well, that makes it worse! In any event, we found time after time that the Admiralty—with the best intentions in the world, of course—got in straight away and took our sailors' hostels. A particularly bad example of that was in Halifax, but we have had several examples in this country.

I am not here to say that voluntary organisations are perfect. I prefer to call them "voluntary", because if one says "charitable" one gets into trouble straight away. Nobody wants seamen to be the clients, or perhaps it would be better to say the victims, of charity; I think we are all agreed on that. But the voluntary organisations—and I think that this is the view of the British Government—have a place; but they have to reform themselves and they have to work together. I think that on the Seamen's Welfare Board we have made some progress—not much, but some—in that direction. When we found that the voluntary organisations were not prepared to build new and up-to-date hostels, we have built them ourselves, and that, perhaps, is the best solution.

I agree that at the end of the day we want to try to take con-

trol of this welfare movement ourselves. It will be far better if the shipowners and the seafarers, with the help of the Government, can conduct this business for themselves. But I do not think that you will get rid altogether of voluntary organisations, and personally I do not think that you want to; but you do not want them to have the major control, and you do not want the seaman to feel that he must go there and must conform to special rules before he can get any treatment at all.

There is no doubt about it, and we can say it publicly, that some of these voluntary organisations have been "cashing in" on the tasks performed by merchant seamen during the war, and we have even had cases where they have appealed for money on the ground of the assistance that they are giving to merchant seamen while at the very same time they were refusing to admit merchant seamen to their canteens. That is a fact which cannot be disputed.

Now we come to the question of Chinese and Indian seamen. Progress has been slow in this country—I am talking of this country only—with regard to both Chinese and Indian seamen, but you must realise that the problem is very largely a war one. Far more Indians used to come to London than come now. They have now been transferred mostly to Glasgow, and the Indian seamen's representative was generous in acknowledging that we have done something—I agree not enough, but at any rate we have made a start. In Glasgow there is an extremely good hostel which I think is appreciated by the Indian seamen.

We all agree—and particularly the Chinese-employing companies—that the boarding-house position needs drastic cleaning up, and the speech by Mr. Noel-Baker to which Mr. Chu referred was made the other day in opening a new Chinese seamen's club in London. It may interest the Commission to know that the finance of that is entirely contributed by the Chinese-employing companies.

There are Indian Welfare officers appointed by the High Commissioner for India in London in the three principal Lascar ports.

I think that Mr. Curran is absolutely right when he says that the keynote of all this welfare progress must be to treat the seaman as a citizen. We want to get away from the idea that a seaman, because he is a seaman, ought to go to some special club. Nine times out of ten he wants to get home and be an ordinary citizen like anyone else. But there are circumstances where that is not possible, and where special provision must be made for seamen. It would be a good thing if we could abolish the whole idea of separate institutions for seamen, but we cannot quite get rid of them, because we need to make special provision for seamen, in foreign ports in particular.

I should like to pay a tribute to what the United States of America has done and is still doing for British seamen. When Mr. Jarman, Captain Coombs and I went to the United States eighteen months ago we had as one of our primary objects to see whether the facilities for the welfare of British seamen in U.S.A. ports could be developed. I am bound to say that we got an even more enthusiastic response from the Americans themselves than from some of our own British officials; and I should like to pay this tribute to the Americans for helping us.

In the second place, I am sure that the British representatives on the Commission will want to thank the American labour movement for putting a very considerable sum of money at our disposal, with which we equipped a merchant navy club in the West End of London. It is an experiment, but I hope and believe that it will be a successful experiment. Our only regret is that we were not able to have it open in time for this Commission.

Captain COOMBS: I should like forthwith to associate myself with the tribute that Mr. Snedden has paid to the attitude of the American Government and of the American labour movement in this matter of welfare.

I should like to report briefly to the Commission that reading rooms and service facilities are provided by the Allied officers' unions in all the ports of this country, and in London and New York, and although these services are industrial and professional in character, they have a definite welfare aspect. I understand that the seamen's unions have done the same. I do not think that it should be left off the record that the unions themselves have done a great deal, directly as well as indirectly, in the welfare movement.

I take it that it falls within the Geneva Recommendation, and I know it is a matter which the present British Minister of Labour has very much at heart, and I hope it can be incorporated in a resolution here, that attention should be given to a medical research service as far as seamen are concerned. I readily agree that it may not be wholly practicable in wartime, but I think that this Commission should take the opportunity of urging that attention should be directed to this vast field, which has never, as far as I know, been scientifically investigated. There are numbers of matters which suggest themselves—food, ventilation, the effects of ship-board life, the watch system, diseases (particularly duodenal trouble, which appears to be prevalent among seamen), and so on. There is a whole field of research of a kind which has taken place in other industries and which should be explored in connection with the shipping industry; and I hope the Commission will agree

that the attention of the authorities concerned should be drawn to the matter, either by resolution or in some other way.

I associate myself wholly, as one who has served with Indian and Chinese seamen, with the plea which has been made by the Indian and Chinese seamen's representatives and supported, I am not surprised to find, from the shipowners' side by Mr. Snedden. I am wholly in agreement with the view that attention should be paid, and promptly paid, to the removal of what is undoubtedly a very disgraceful state of affairs. There are difficulties, of course. We are all agreed that there should be no discrimination so far as race, colour and religion are concerned; but I feel sure that the Asiatic representatives here will equally agree that they do require special treatment by virtue of their special customs and food and religious requirements. At the same time, the provisions for their welfare should be of the same availability and of the same standard, but adjusted for their own requirements, as are provided in the case of other races.

Mr. CHING: I thank you very much for giving me permission to speak about the condition of our local Chinese seamen, and especially on the question of the boarding-house system. I was glad to hear of the recent opening in Pennyfields of a rest centre for some of our people, and I was glad to hear the assurance of co-operation on the part of the Shipping Federation which was given by Mr. Snedden a few moments ago. I am sure that now that we have the promise of co-operation between the Shipping Federation and the Chinese Seamen's Union it is possible to envisage quite a long step forward.

Prior to 1940 the existing practice of the shipowners in using boarding houses and contractors may have been justified, because there was no representative or official body to represent our Chinese seamen; but I think that it would be a mistake on the part of our shipowner friends to perpetuate this system, which we find inflicts great hardship on our Chinese seamen.

From the investigations which we have been able to make, we find that these people do exploit the seamen. The shipping companies pay a flat rate per head for maintenance, and the boarding-house master is not there for philanthropy or for any general purpose, but to make as much as he can per head out of the Chinese seamen. That system still exists. Prior to the war there was a flat rate of 5s. a head, and many Chinese seamen went to these boarding houses and got the equivalent of 1s. for lodging and 1s.6d. for food, making a total of 2s.6d.; the difference of 2s.6d., to which they would be rightly entitled according to the amount paid by the shipping companies, went into the pocket of the boarding-house master.

I think it is quite unfair that such a system should be perpetuated, and, now that we have this assurance of co-operation on the part of the Shipping Federation, our union will gladly consult with them and help them out of any responsibility in discharging this matter by considering ways and means of ensuring that our Chinese seamen get the full value of the maintenance allowance provided for them.

Mr. CURRAN: Mr. Snedden has paid a tribute to the American labour movement and to the Government of the United States and to the people of the United States in general for the help which they have given to British seamen. I should like to say that we too owe quite a debt of gratitude to the British seamen and the British people for the way in which they have treated our people when they come over here, and especially for the way in which the British seamen have treated our people when they have been rescued from the sea; they have given them everything they have got and taken care of them in a way which has made our people say, "They gave us everything they had".

On the question of the club which is being adopted by the American labour movement, I should like to say that that is being done by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union on their own, and not by the entire labour movement. I want you to be quite clear on that, although the American labour movement will no doubt join in with the other labour movements of the world in order to build up and continue this type of welfare work.

Fifth and Eighth Sitzings, 28 and 30 June 1942

(In the intervals between sittings minor drafting amendments to a resolution submitted by the seamen's group at the conclusion of the Fourth Sitting were agreed upon, and at the Eighth Sitting the Commission adopted unanimously and without further discussion the resolution in the form given in Part III.)

Equality of Treatment of Seafarers

Seventh Sitting, 29 June 1942

The following resolution was submitted by the seamen's group:

Whereas recorded decisions were reached at the International Labour Conference in 1929 and 1936 on the subject of marked inequalities of treatment of seamen of certain nationalities,

And whereas inequalities still exist in respect of Chinese, Indian and other seamen in merchant vessels, giving rise to grievous privation and the fermenting of disputes and unrest among the seamen and causing desertions in certain ports,

And whereas such disputes and unrest have led to serious disturbances and unrest and tend to retard war shipping, in which these seamen serving in the merchant fleets of the United Nations are rendering invaluable service with admirable skill and perseverance,

The Joint Maritime Commission requests the International Labour Office to take appropriate and immediate steps to remedy the situation so as to secure equality of treatment.

Mr. CHU: Chinese seamen have been serving British, Dutch and other European shipowners for upward of eighty years, so that we have no reason to quit our jobs, particularly in this time of war when we are fighting against our foes in a common cause; but, since war broke out in Europe in 1939, the situation has been greatly changed. There has been the change from peace to war, and, as a result of the war, Chinese seamen working in foreign ships are being affected by two things: desertion, and the killing of Chinese crews. I must tell you frankly why these incidents happen. There are, of course, some grievances.

First of all, I want to tell you about the beginning of the employment of Chinese crews in the Far East. Chinese crews are most frequently recruited in Singapore, Hong Kong and Shanghai. The shipowners have taken advantage of the prevalence of cheap labour, and have been glad of a supply of labour which the ordinary demands of the labour market are unable to absorb. Secondly, the value of Asiatic workers has been assessed as one quarter of that of European workers. As a result of that economic situation and that physiological belief, the supply of cheap labour on a low standard of living has been maintained. Then, because the shipowners wanted to continue to maintain such exploitation by engaging cheap labour in the Far East, the so-called contract labour system was introduced, and this system has long been encouraged and used in the Far East by shipowners. That is the second point. Thirdly, there have been misunderstandings which have arisen over language. Chinese crews sign a contract the text of which is in English. I cannot read English properly, and I do not think that most Chinese crews can read English as well as I do.

Fourthly, wages before the war were very low. In a cargo boat a Chinese seaman was paid only £1 18s.9d., and in tankers £3 15s. However, an agreement has recently been reached between British shipowners and Chinese seamen which provides for certain improvements. Fifthly, there is discrimination against the Chinese seamen in regard to compensation, pension and family allowance. If a

Chinese seaman is killed, a limited sum of between £60 and £100 is paid to his family. Again, the detention and family allowances made to British seamen are given on page 14 of the I.L.O. white book "The War and Merchant Seamen: I" but on page 15 there is a note: "These schemes do not apply to Chinese or Indian members of the crew of British ships".

In the sixth place, there is no shore leave granted to Chinese seamen. On account mainly of the low rates of pay which they receive, some Chinese seamen have tried to desert from their ships in the U.S.A. Statistics show that in March of this year 16 per cent. of the desertions in the port of New York were of Chinese crews. In a rigorous effort to prevent desertion by Chinese seamen, the United States immigration authorities prohibit shore leave for Chinese seamen when their ships come to the United States. Without going into legal technicalities, this denial of shore leave appears unjustifiable. In the first place, seamen of other nationalities also desert their ships in far greater numbers, but only Chinese seamen are punished by being deprived of shore leave. Secondly, Chinese seamen are being penalised for an offence which they have not committed, an offence on the part of other seamen with whom they have no relations save the accident of similar nationality. It is impossible to sustain the argument that because some Chinese seamen have deserted therefore all other Chinese seamen would also desert if and when given shore leave. That is against the principle of common law that a man is to be regarded as innocent until he is proved guilty.

Next I wish to give you some statistics of what has happened not only in the ports of the United States but in many other places. In Alexandria, four Chinese seamen were killed and two wounded in a Dutch ship. In Fremantle two Chinese seamen on a Dutch ship were killed and three wounded. In Curacao twelve Chinese seamen on a Dutch ship were killed and thirty-five wounded. In New York one Chinese seaman was killed on a British ship and another two Chinese seamen were wounded on a British ship. Altogether 19 were killed and 42 wounded between March 7 and June 4, about 90 days; on an average, every 36 hours a Chinese seaman was killed or wounded.

What do the Chinese seamen want? In the first place, they do not want to exploit the war conditions for their own benefit, but they do demand fairness and reasonableness. Secondly, the Chinese seamen are hard workers. I think that Captain Coombs and Mr. Jarman know that, and even the shipowners will not say that the Chinese seamen are not hard workers; and they are as efficient as all other seamen. Thirdly, the Chinese are not mysterious;

Chinese seamen are very honest and sincere, and are as good citizens as you are. Fourthly, the Chinese are patriotic, and they very wholeheartedly support the war effort of the United Nations. Fifthly, I shall not talk about how brave Chinese seamen are, but already hundreds of Chinese seamen have been drowned at sea in helping to bring war materials to the war fronts to assist in the fight for freedom.

In the vital task of war shipping the Chinese seamen are really playing an important part. In the past they have endured all the grievances of discrimination. There was imperialism and there were colonies in the Far East. Now they are told that they are allies of the British and American peoples, and of all the other peoples of the United Nations. They are told that the present war against the Axis is to safeguard the freedom and the liberty of all peoples. But what do they actually find? In England, they find themselves humiliated by racial discrimination. In U.S.A. ports, they find themselves prisoners on board, at the point of the pistol. Yet the United Nations are fighting to secure freedom from fear and freedom from want for all nations! As a matter of fact, Japanese propaganda has been capitalising the bad treatment of Chinese people by British administrations in the Far East to divide China from her British ally. By persisting in the practice of discrimination, the shipowners are playing into the hands of the Japanese, and are furnishing them with arguments for their favourite fake slogan, "Asia for Asiatics".

I am sure that by their hard toil for over eighty years for foreign merchant marines, the Chinese seamen have now earned your sympathy and respect. In their name I appeal to you for your co-operation and support, with a view to the immediate amelioration of their labour standards and the immediate liberation from inhumane treatment by port authorities. You can best show your support by adopting the resolution which I propose. Inspired as we all are by the common hope of victory, we should not allow any suspicion of racial discrimination to stand in the way of our collaboration, to prejudice our solidarity, or to jeopardise our fight for freedom and social justice.

Captain COOMBS: I do not know whether this is the time to throw out what I hope will be regarded as a constructive suggestion. I think that many of the difficulties which have arisen in cases of attacks and counter-attacks on board ship are due in large measure to misunderstandings due to language difficulties. I therefore hope that when the time comes to consider training I may be permitted to put forward what I hope will be a useful suggestion.

Mr. WEISBERGER: It is the opinion of our organisation that the wages of the Chinese seamen and of seamen of all other nationalities should be raised to the level of those of American seamen. We are all doing the same work; we are all taking the same chances. There is no reason in the world why the hidebound, reactionary shipping trusts of Europe should be allowed to exploit the merchant seamen. These seamen are sailing their ships and protecting the interests of all, and it is the wish and will of the merchant seamen to do everything in their power to help to win this war; but, speaking for the American seamen, we have nothing but contempt for anyone, for any type of employer, whether British or American, who uses this war to line his pockets; and we as an organisation will not stand idly by and see this being done. Our sympathies and our support are 100 per cent. with the downtrodden Chinese seamen, and also with the European seamen, whom the European shipping interests would make into coolies if they could. That is the position of our organisation.

Mr. ALLEY: Including war bonus, a British fireman gets £23 2s. 6d. a month, while an Indian fireman, including war bonus, gets £3 10s. Then with regard to compensation, if our seamen are torpedoed and taken over here their earnings are stopped and they are automatically discharged from the sea, and, if they have not left any allotment on the other side, in Calcutta or Bombay, their families go without any money whatever for months and months. If they suffer personal injury, British shipowners have obligations under two Acts, the Act in this country and the Act in India. Under the Act of this country they have to pay a little more, and so they say, "You go back to India, and your compensation will be dealt with there".

With regard to working conditions, there is no fixation of hours and no overtime is paid. The master or the engineer can call on Indian seamen to work at any time, work for which they do not get a single pie. If the Commission would like me to go on, I can tell them what is happening to-day, in June 1942. The American seamen are getting £50 (I think it is) a month, and the Yugoslavs get the same amount. English conditions are among the worst—I do not say the worst—but, even taking that standard, our standard in relation to it is as 1 to 7; they get £23 2s. 6d. and we get £3 10s.

The Indian Government, of course, say that this question is governed by law. The argument of the employers, when we try to approach them on this question of wages, is "We have to take more men when we employ Indians". That question was brought up when the Shipping Subsidy Bill was under discussion in the

House of Commons, and it was found that the actual proportion was 20 English seamen to 29 Indians—not because the Indians were weaker or lazier, but because they were not sufficiently trained. Who was responsible for not giving them the necessary training is a question which I shall not go into now.

I shall not go into the anti-fascist nature of the whole struggle and movement of the Indian people, but I should like to say that in the last war 3,500 Indian seamen were killed, and during this war I think that more than 3,000 have been killed. I think that that is a moderate estimate, because all the statistics are not published and we do not want them to be published. The figures must be known to the Ministry of War Transport, but my estimate is that more than 3,000 Indians have been killed and wounded in this war.

At this juncture in the world's history, when everywhere we are being told that the war will be fought to a victorious end so that the principle of democracy and the principle of freedom from want and freedom from fear may prevail, this discrimination between white and yellow and white and black must disappear, and all must be recognised as human beings; but, when we are being told all these things, unless some part of them is put into practice it is difficult for us to take them at their face value.

The people of China and the people of India, put together, amount to half the world. The conditions that exist on British ships in particular for Chinese seamen and Indian seamen are a challenge to the sincerity of British employers. What are they going to do about it? We know that the world of the future will be ours, because we are half the world.

Mr. CURRAN: I am not going to attempt to deal with the past. I think we can all agree that the ethics of the world, and not of any particular person or group of persons alone, have not been all that they should be down through the ages, and the result has been that we are in the position in which we find ourselves now. But I believe we have noticed in this Commission, and we have certainly found it to be so in our collective bargaining arrangements in the United States, and I assume that it is so in other countries, that there is an enlightened viewpoint to-day with respect to the relations between employers and employees. The arrangements now being made show that there is a big desire on all sides to move forward and not to stand still in the matter of social and economic reforms, or, if not reforms, let us say progress.

Mr. Chu referred to the fact that in the United States the immigration laws do not permit Chinese seamen—and I suppose

the same thing applies to Indian seamen—to go ashore because of the high bonds which have to be put up. How that originated is beyond my knowledge, but I have an idea that the influence of other Governments and the influence, probably, of some of our own people, caused that to come into effect, because of desertions and other things. These desertions, in my opinion, were caused by the conditions under which the men worked.

However, to-day, unless I am very much mistaken, there is great sincerity on the part of all in desiring to do something about these problems and to adjust them and make progress; otherwise we should not be able to accept at its face value that Atlantic Charter, which says that the entire world should be free from want and should have liberty. That applies to every part of the world; you cannot select one human being and say that he should have more liberty than another.

I want to make it clear that in the United States, and I assume throughout the world, the organisations are taking steps to correct the condition which exists; and therefore I think that this resolution, if given effective support afterwards, of course, in actions by the various representatives from the various countries, will make it possible in a short space of time to show to the Indian seamen and to the Chinese seamen and others that we are definitely moving forward, and in that way at least we shall be able to demonstrate progress. I hope that this resolution will receive the unanimous support of everybody here, and I believe that it will; but, beyond that, I believe that for it to be effective there should be a definite pledge that everybody, both in the shipowners' group and in the seamen's group and in the Government group, will recognise the necessity for the course for which the workers have fought for a good many years, so that some definite steps will be taken to correct some of the inequalities which now exist.

I also want to make it clear that I am here representing my own organisation, and I speak for my own organisation. I do not propose to speak for all the American seamen; I speak for the section that I represent.

Mr. ERULKAR: I rise to support this resolution wholeheartedly. It will be recalled that at the Maritime Conference of 1936, when the Draft Convention on sickness insurance was under consideration, one of the clauses had the effect of depriving certain seamen of the benefits of that Convention on the grounds of non-residence; in other words, if they were not resident in this country they were not entitled to the benefits under that Convention. It will be recalled that the Indian shipowners' delegate and the Indian

seamen's delegate submitted a joint statement pressing for the deletion of that clause. Unfortunately that motion was lost, and I may mention that the British seamen voted against it. There was a record vote, and they voted against deletion, with the result that there was this discrimination introduced with regard to certain social benefits.

India has one of the largest seafaring populations of the world. Owing to certain political conditions resulting in economic upheaval, Indian shipping, which was once in the forefront, became non-existent, and the result was that this large population was thrown out of employment and had to seek employment elsewhere. To-day the position is that the bulk of the Indian seafaring population is employed on non-national ships, and there is no power in the Indian legislature which can control the conditions of employment of Indians on non-national ships. The result is that we see the injustice and the grievances to which references have been made by the seamen's group here.

I therefore appeal to this Commission to do its best to extend to the workers who have not the protection of their own Governments the same conditions which are extended to nationals. Let it not be said that because the Governments of their respective countries are powerless, these men are being denied the very elementary humanitarian conditions and treatment to which the nationals of the countries to which the ships belong have been entitled for years. I am sure we shall all agree with what my friend Mr. Alley has said. After the war, the International Labour Organisation will have to deal with over 800,000,000 coloured people, and we cannot deny to them the rights for which the Organisation stands.

Mr. JARMAN: I want to correct one point which Mr. Erulkar made. It is not fair to say that any seafarers' organisation took the step which he says they took. There was no discrimination. It was because there was no insurance system or any administrative machinery in India to administer the benefits or anything that we were trying to do that we were bound to take the step we did.

Mr. ERULKAR: May I reply to that? The Draft Convention said that any Member of the International Labour Organisation might in its national laws or regulations make such exceptions as it deemed necessary in respect of "... (d) persons not resident in the territory of the Member". In other words, those coloured seamen who are employed here, not being resident in this country, could be excluded from the operation of the Convention. It was an administrative discrimination, not a *de jure* exclusion.

Mr. JARMAN: Mr. Bowden happened to be our delegate at this Conference and dealt with this point, and he assures me that you are wrong.

Mr. BOWDEN: Mr. Erulkar suggests that there was discrimination on account of race, but there was no such discrimination at all. The point was that the Indian seaman himself paid no health insurance contribution whatever, and what contribution was paid was paid by the shipowner. The seaman himself paid no contribution.

Mr. ERULKAR: He was never asked to do so, and the contribution paid by the shipowner in respect of the Indian seaman was used for the benefit of British seamen.

Mr. BOWDEN: And there was no administrative machinery in India by which the benefits could be paid. We strongly urged that the Indian Government should at the earliest opportunity establish insurance institutions in India. There was no question of discrimination because of colour or race.

Mr. ERULKAR: Not in so many words, but in operation there was discrimination; there is no doubt about that. How can insurance in India control the employment of Indian nationals on this side? There is no power in the Indian legislature to do it.

Mr. OLDENBROEK: First of all, I do not think that there is any misunderstanding about the fact that the workers' group are absolutely united on this resolution. As a matter of fact, only a few weeks ago we adopted a resolution in connection with this meeting in which we said: "We consider it imperative to level up the wages and general conditions of employment of coloured seamen in order to establish equality as a basis for full and effective co-operation after the war and as an essential element in a new world order".

It is not only a problem of Chinese and Indian seamen; there are other—I hate the word, but I do not know an alternative for it—coloured seamen or non-white seamen employed in the mercantile marines of several countries—in the mercantile marine of the Netherlands, for instance. We have been able to do a great deal already in that respect. Our West Indian seamen, who were paid 70 per cent. less than we white seamen were getting, have been levelled up with regard to wages and with regard to war bonuses, and so it seems possible to do it; we did it, at any rate, and we are going to continue to do it for all the non-white seamen who are working in our ships.

There is an argument not in favour of low wages but to explain why low wages are paid, the argument that in the countries concerned the standard of living is exceedingly low, and so on. But to-day these seamen are not serving along the coasts of their own country, but are doing exactly the same work as other seamen, crossing the Atlantic and Pacific, taking the same risks as other seamen and doing exactly the same work.

It is not true to-day—as it was, perhaps, fifty or even twenty years ago—that you require more of these coloured seamen to man the ship. That is no longer true. In Dutch ships, with Chinese seamen the same number can do the same work as Europeans; why, then, should not they be entitled to the same conditions? They are doing the same work, and they are not going back to their own country but staying outside, as many of us have to do. For those reasons, we think that equality of treatment is only just.

There is one other point I want to make. The question of the manning of ships will give us some headaches in future, and the Chinese and Indian and other coloured seamen will have to help us out.

Mr. DE WITTE: On Belgian ships we have coloured seamen from the Belgian Congo. They are perhaps better paid than the Indian seamen, but I should like to draw the attention of the Commission to the fact that it was only on 1 May last that those seamen received a war bonus of £5; not one shilling of war bonus was paid to them before that. I have seen in the Belgian newspapers articles praising the great courage of the coloured seamen; on the other hand, I have information that the Belgian shipowners do not want to give the Belgian seamen's union the right to interfere with the wages and working conditions of coloured seamen. I cannot agree with such an attitude, and I fully support the resolution. As a representative of the Belgian seamen, I claim the right to defend the coloured seamen.

Eighth Sitting, 30 June 1942

Mr. HUDIG: We have thoroughly discussed this problem, which is a problem of the highest importance, and we think that a simple, amended resolution may be found acceptable to our friends on the other side. I should like to read it:

The members of this Joint Maritime Commission record their admiration of the war effort of Chinese, Indian and all other seamen from Asia, Africa and the East and West Indies serving in the fleets of the United Nations.

They urge that in collaboration with the respective organisations and Governments concerned all practicable steps should be taken to ensure that in the conditions of employment and general treatment of these seamen there may be no unfavourable comparison with crews of vessels in similar trades and under the same registry.

Mr. CHU: I do not understand why Chinese and other Asiatic seamen should not have the same treatment as other seamen. They do the same work and run the same risks. They risk their lives in the same way as other seamen, and they face the same dangers as other seamen; why should not they be treated on an equality with other seamen? I do not understand why they should be treated on a basis of inequality.

You will recall that at the Maritime Conference of 1929 the principle of equal treatment was laid down. A resolution was adopted to say that the Conference taking cognisance of the existence of marked inequalities in the treatment of the seamen of certain nationalities, and especially those from Asiatic countries, as compared with other seamen performing the same work, especially in such matters as wages, hours, insurance, workmen's compensation, and so forth, requested the International Labour Office (1) to enquire into the conditions of life and labour of Asiatic seamen, and in particular where they are employed outside their country or on board foreign vessels, and (2) to consider whether the question should be placed on the agenda of an early Session of the International Labour Conference.¹

¹ The full text of the resolution adopted by the 13th Session of the International Labour Conference in 1929 was as follows:

Whereas equality of treatment of seamen without distinction of race or nationality is an essential factor in the improvement of conditions of life and labour throughout the world;

Whereas marked inequalities at present exist in the treatment of the seamen of certain nationalities, especially those from Asiatic countries, as compared with other seamen performing the same work, in particular in such matters as wages, hours, the system of recruitment, unemployment, housing, health, the protection afforded by the laws of the country of the shipowner in respect of insurance, workmen's compensation, freedom of association, etc.; and

Whereas the Twelfth Session of the International Labour Conference adopted a Resolution recalling the necessity of equal treatment of national workers and coloured foreign workers and requesting the Governing Body of the International Labour Office to consider the desirability of placing this question, if possible, on the Agenda of the 1931 Session;

The Conference requests the Governing Body

(1) To call the special attention of the International Labour Office, in carrying out the enquiry known as the "Asiatic enquiry", to the present conditions of life and labour of Asiatic seamen, as mentioned above, and in particular when they are employed outside their country or on board foreign vessels, and

(2) To consider whether this question could be placed on the Agenda of an early Session of the Conference.

Also in 1936, at the 21st Session of the Conference, the International Labour Office was asked to find ways and means of reaching the objectives which were laid down in 1929. In my view the shipowners' amendment should be rejected, because it is totally opposed to the principle laid down by the International Labour Conference in 1929 and 1936.

Furthermore, we are now fighting for freedom and democracy; we are fighting for the peoples who are being oppressed. Under this amendment, where do the free democracies stand? The amendment means that the Asiatic seamen should be entitled to equality to some extent, not that they should be treated equally. The argument of the employers is always that the living standards in Asiatic countries are so low, but in fact the seamen who are employed by foreign shipowners are living in foreign countries, so that they spend more than other seamen spend, because everything is foreign to them and new to them. Moreover, the International Labour Organisation exists to bring about social justice, so why should not we try to raise these low standards of living? Do you think that they should always remain as low as they are at present? I do not think so. We are working and fighting for social justice, and we have to raise these low living standards.

I should like to give this warning to the shipowners. They may not wish to discriminate against the seamen from the Far East, but I want to warn them that there will be no possibility of discriminating against the peoples of the Far East and of exploiting cheap labour in the Far East hereafter. When I was in America, many friends said to me, "Why should you Chinese seamen work in foreign ships? If they treat you badly, you can give up and go back to your own country." Logically, that is quite right. Why should we Chinese seamen work in foreign ships? We should have our own ships, and these seamen should work in their own ships. I tell the shipowners frankly, however, that at the present time Chinese seamen are not working in foreign ships simply to earn their own living; they are doing so to help to win the war. I ask the shipowners, do you need their work? They are working for the purpose of winning the war. We are all allied countries, and we want to pool our forces. You have the ships; you have the facilities to bring the war supplies to the war fronts. We have the man-power to help to bring the war supplies to the war fronts. The Chinese seamen are not working on foreign ships just to earn a living, and I hope that the shipowners will realise this.

We reject this suggested amendment, but the question of what is to be done lies with the shipowners. The Chinese seamen are in your hands. Whether you will treat them badly or give them

equality with other seamen depends on yourselves, but we shall continue to fight until we get equality of treatment.

Ninth Sitting, 30 June 1942

(Mr. Jarman announced that the seamen's group was prepared to accept the revised text of the resolution submitted at the previous sitting on behalf of the shipowners' group. He intimated, however, that his group would like a representative of the shipowners' group to say, for record purposes, what was meant by the two words "unfavourable comparison".)

Mr. CURRAN: Mr. Jarman in putting the resolution asked the question that I wanted to ask of Mr. Snedden. The resolution as it stands now (the first paragraph is the praiseworthy section of the document) makes me somewhat fearful about the interpretation to be placed on the last paragraph. Interpretations might be made that would not lend themselves to our general opinion, which is that we should go forward from here and try to build conditions so that there will be no duplication of some of the conditions which have existed up till now.

I am afraid that unless we do have an interpretation on the record here, so as to be clear, it would be possible for this to be nullified completely in many respects by individuals placing their own interpretation upon it. I know that the operators in the Joint Maritime Commission as a whole intend it to be as we interpret it; that this Commission as a whole wants and is anxious to see that "equality of treatment" means that we hope sometime to reach that type of treatment for all seamen that does not leave any one section under one type of treatment and another section under a better type of treatment.

The reason I am fearful of this situation is because I believe it was made clear by the representative of the Indian seamen the other day, and his view was supported by the operator of the Scindia Steamship Company, that we are now trying to build and to plan for a new world and in that new world we definitely have got to work towards a basis that all human beings are equal, and all human beings deserve equal treatment.

For that reason I think it would be well for the record to show a clear-cut interpretation of this particular paragraph, so that we are very clear on it, and I wonder if the shipowners' representative would do that?

Mr. SNEDDEN: We had a very long discussion in our group, and had long discussions with Mr. Oldenbroek and Mr. Chu and I think we got nearer understanding each other's point of view

than ever before, and what I am saying is in accordance with what we settled with them. Our difficulty was that "equality of treatment" does not mean "identity of treatment", and I think that is the main point there. We had this sort of difficulty in the recent prolonged but ultimately successful negotiations between the British Government, the Chinese Government, the British shipowners and representatives of Chinese seamen in this country, laying down rates of wages and other conditions of employment for the Chinese. That agreement was blessed by the Chinese Government here and in Chungking and the principle we accepted there was the principle of equality, but that was interpreted by the Chinese representatives themselves as not meaning identity. One would take into account the fact—I do not know whether it is necessary or not, but it is the fact—that different numbers of Chinese are employed as compared with whites, and the fact that there were other special expenses incurred with Chinese crews that were not incurred in connection with whites.

That is why we say "equality" does not mean "identity" and that is what we mean by "no unfavourable comparison".

Mr. ERULKAR: That does not entirely represent my viewpoint. I agree with Mr. Snedden and the group as to equality not being identical in regard only to wages, and then I would have suggested something to this effect, "subject to equitable adjustment of wages when parity of efficiency is reached". With regard to all other services I feel that there is no justification for saying that we will not give identical treatment to the other Asiatics.

Mr. CHU: I want to explain one point regarding the agreement recently reached between the two parties. It does not represent the view of the workers' associations in China.

Mr. CURRAN: I realise that the meeting up to this point has gone along smoothly and we have tried to meet what little differences might occur and to take the middle-of-the-road position, recognising the fact that we cannot accomplish things overnight; it will take a long period of time to really accomplish. We have been in a spirit to meet these problems jointly in the best way possible with the view of going step by step. I believe—I think I speak for my colleague too, I am not sure—we have gone along on that basis; but I would like to remind this Commission that as we say in the States you cannot "pussyfoot" or "pass the buck" on some questions because if you do, you will have them there the next time you meet, and you may have them there under different circumstances. We to-day are going through a terrible conflagra-

tion; we propose to win that war and I am sure we will. I submit that unless we remove the causes of this type of conflagration we have not accomplished all we set out to accomplish and I want it made clear for myself, for the people that I represent and, I believe, the general viewpoint of the American people, that there must be no "pussyfooting" on the question of the equality of treatment of any human being in the world to-day if we are going to build a world where we will be able to live in peace and harmony and, as the Bible would have it, doing unto our brothers as we would have them do unto us.

I want it made clear that I cannot accept a position that says, "With respect to wages we will give equal treatment, but with respect to social and other conditions we cannot exactly reach that stage, but we will try to apparently give that type of treatment". I want to be clear in the record that I disagree with that kind of approach to the question. I think we have to look it square in the face, we have to say to-day, "We are not able to overcome all the evils that have existed for centuries, but, by God, we are willing to take a stand that it is not correct, we do not believe in it, and we want to see equality of treatment" — just that, equality of treatment for all human beings.

That is my position and I wish it to be recorded as such—for all human beings.

Mr. SNEDDEN: Mr. Curran has misunderstood me, I think. What I said, and what the Chinese Government itself said in negotiation with the British Government, was that equality of treatment did not mean identity of treatment. I did not say we were agreeing to equality of wages but not equality of social benefits.

Mr. CURRAN: I do not want to prolong the discussion. I did not understand your approach and I said as much. I said that if the question is not dealt with properly it will plague all humanity. It has to be dealt with. Human beings are human beings; you cannot deal with them as if they were in the market place.

Mr. SNEDDEN: I agree; what I said was "equality" does not mean "identity" and that in considering the equality of treatment as a whole you have to consider not only wages but the number of crew carried. It is a matter of opinion whether you need to carry more or less. With regard to the other general conditions of employment, whatever they are, perhaps some social legislation of a different kind for Chinese from that for British should be carried out; I do not know, but that was the view accepted in our negotiations by the Chinese Government themselves. I did

not say "equality of wages" and I did not say "disparity in other conditions"; I did not say that at all.

Mr. CURRAN: As I understand it—I might as well be perfectly clear—it means that this Commission urges and hopes to strive for equality of treatment. "Identity of treatment" would mean, to put it crudely, that if a Chinese seaman wanted corn flakes for breakfast and ham and eggs were being served, he would be forced to eat the ham and eggs and could not get the corn flakes. That is what you mean by "identity of treatment"; he is not forced to accept all the conditions which go along with the equality of treatment. I think to us it is clear, the Maritime Commission will strive to see that some day steps will be taken as rapidly as possible to bring about equality of social and economic conditions for all seamen.

Mr. CHU: I just want to speak on one point. I should like Mr. Snedden not to limit himself as representing British interests, when discussing this problem. He had referred to the declaration by the Chinese Government regarding the treatment of seamen who had been unequally treated as a whole. This is an international organisation and we should discuss the international problems. I would also like Mr. Snedden to make this point clear, did "unfavourable comparison" mean that there should be comparative treatment between the seamen who have been ill-treated and between the crews or others?

Mr. OLDENBROEK: I would ask you to bring the matter to the vote, but may I make one very short statement? I know I am speaking on behalf of the workers' group. We still believe that our original resolution expressed our views, but we are prepared to accept the amendment of the employers because we want an opportunity for continuing immediately after this meeting to improve conditions of the workers to whom that resolution refers.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the exchange that has taken place within the last few minutes has indicated that there is not really much between the two sides. All these problems are not static, they are dynamic, and you cannot at any particular date reach a final and complete solution when they have so long a history as this one has. But you can be sure that you are on the right road and that you have brought yourselves very close to a position in which, without any explanation from each other, you will be sure that you have reached the point to which you wished to go. As I understand this resolution at present, it would be expressing the

views of the Joint Maritime Commission as to the spirit and object with which further negotiations with regard to the conditions of seamen should be discussed and settled.

In ordinary industry, of course, we have examples of equality of treatment without complete identity. Take any industry in this country, you will find that for various reasons, various circumstances, with the same kind of worker, there are little changes, little differences in his conditions in different districts, in different establishments, but all of them are based on equality, because they are made by the same organisations. And that I think is the distinction between equality and identity.

I myself feel that so much depends upon this particular subject not being presented to the world in a way which promotes harmful and damaging propaganda, propaganda I think which would be in the end not helpful to any side, to either side.

I hope that when putting this to the vote we may do so with both sides feeling quite honestly and sincerely, arising from these discussions, that they are imbued with the same idea that, taking all circumstances into consideration, without distinction of race, all men shall be assured of an equal standard of conditions in life.

Is there any objection to this resolution in its amended form? Then I declare it carried.

TELEGRAM FROM THE CHINESE SEAMEN'S UNION

During the course of the Sixth Sitting, Mr. Chu communicated to the Commission the following telegram he had just received from the Chinese National Seamen's Union, Chungking, dated 28 June 1942:

It is of the greatest importance to hold the Joint Maritime Commission at a time when we are fighting against our foes for our common cause. Chinese seamen are willing to serve in contributing their share in the war effort of the Allied nations shoulder to shoulder with their Allied brothers. The Chinese National Seamen's Union wishes to urge for your consideration the following matters: (1) equality of treatment of Chinese seamen; (2) equal chance for shore leave; (3) welfare and recreation centres for all Chinese seamen in principal ports of all maritime countries. The Chinese National Seamen's Union takes this opportunity of congratulating the Joint Maritime Commission.

International Maritime Charter*Seventh Sitting, 29 June 1942*

The following resolution was submitted by the seamen's group:

The Joint Maritime Commission invites the International Labour Office to prepare an International Maritime Charter, as an international minimum standard applicable to seafarers of all nationalities, embodying the best practicable social legislation affecting seafarers.

Mr. TENNANT: This resolution does not ask merely for the collecting together of information; we want something more than that. We know that information can be collected, and that there is a wealth of information obtainable from collective agreements and from legislation in the various countries.

In the past, we feel that many seamen's problems which have been dealt with on an international basis have also been dealt with on a piecemeal basis. Various Conventions have been adopted from time to time to deal with separate subjects. We suggest that the Office should collect together what is contained in the various international Conventions which have been adopted, go through the various collective agreements which are in operation in the different countries, look at the social legislation affecting seamen in the various countries and, in the light of all that information, select the best which is obtainable in them all and draft them together in the form of an International Maritime Code.

We believe that that is essential, having regard to the fact that there is no other industry of such an international character as the shipping industry. The common experiences of seamen bring them together and give them a common outlook. They have common aspirations, and we believe that it is possible and practicable to go through all that information to which I have referred and produce a code which could perhaps be agreed to internationally.

We think that that has many advantages. It will be a marked step towards the elimination of unnecessary competition between the various maritime countries. We believe also that if such an international minimum code of conditions could be established it would make possible uniform development in the future; it would make it possible to move forward on an international and uniform basis. We believe that the international basis of it would provide not a ceiling but a floor on which to build in the future.

We also believe that it would be a marked contribution towards ensuring peace, when once peace is re-established. We believe that

the seeds of war have been partly sown by competition, and we believe that if we all make efforts to remove that competition by getting uniformity and international understanding, we shall do something towards the avoidance of another war.

We believe also that it would be particularly welcome at this time if a statement of this kind could be made and a resolution of this kind unanimously adopted, as it would remove the fear—and this is a very distinct fear—among seamen that these agreements are wartime agreements, and that when the war is over and people's larders are full again all the lip-service now being paid to seamen will very quickly be forgotten. We believe that it will be a contribution towards winning the war to let the seamen see that there is not only the will but the intention to do something on an international basis, securing international uniformity of conditions on the highest and not the lowest standard in the future.

We ask the shipowners to look on this as a new approach to this problem. If they do so, they will not only render a service to humanity, and to the seafarers in particular, but make it possible for us to put on permanent record the debt of gratitude which civilisation owes to the seafarer.

Mr. HAUGEN: I should like to stress that the standardisation all over the world in all merchant fleets of sickness insurance and death insurance for seamen is something which should have been done a long time ago. It does not matter where the seamen come from; they have to man the ships. We are right up against the question from the start in these days of war; the men say, "Is there sickness benefit in your ships? What is the death insurance?", and so on. In some cases men refuse to sign on in ships because they are not able to understand the form of sickness benefit, and the same applies to death insurance. These things should have been standardised a long time ago, so as to get that obstacle out of the way.

Then there is the question of the accommodation on board ship. I believe that after the question of wages the question of next importance is that of accommodation on board ship. We have not the lowest standards in that respect, but we have not the best either. But there are many ships sailing the seas to-day where the men's quarters are of such a quality that the ship should never be allowed to sail the ocean.

There should be no obstacles in the way of having the social conditions uniform and standardised to the maximum possible extent. There is no reason why that should not be so, but when we visit the ships of various nations we find there are always some

differences, and often big differences, in the standards and this should be put right in future.

Mr. HUDIG: I think it would be much clearer if, instead of saying "International Maritime Charter" you said "International standard of wages and conditions". What we did not understand were the words "International Maritime Charter", but what you mean, I understand, is that there should be an international standard or schedule.

Mr. JARMAN: We did not want to wait on other industries; we want a Seamen's Charter. We understand that term; it is part of what we call "the brotherhood of the sea", and it is in that sense that it is used.

Mr. HUDIG: I think we understand what is meant.

The CHAIRMAN: It is a complete code of conditions of all kinds, including wages?

Mr. JARMAN: Yes.

Eighth Sitting, 30 June 1942

Mr. WEAVER: I ask permission to say a few words on this resolution, because it is very necessary that the International Labour Office should know exactly what is required of it. As it reads, the resolution is not quite clear. It is not certain whether it means that we are to prepare an International Maritime Charter which would take the form of a Draft Convention ultimately to be placed before a Maritime Session of the International Labour Conference, or whether it is simply an invitation to the International Labour Office to study the possibilities and to draft the bases of an International Maritime Charter. I would suggest, therefore, some such words as these, to make the meaning of the resolution clearer:

The Joint Maritime Commission invites the International Labour Office to study whether it is practicable to draft an International Maritime Charter setting out guiding principles for an international minimum standard. . .

continuing as it stands in the text.

I think that that would leave the International Labour Office free to consider this whole question in all its implications and all its bearings, and then, perhaps, to present in due time—it will take some time, for reasons which are probably obvious to the Commission, to do this piece of work—a report containing a synopsis or conspectus of legislation in the various countries, either

simply in comparative form or in a form which will give indications as to the best bases for an International Maritime Charter in the future. I think that a form of words of that kind would make it easier for the International Labour Office to understand what it is expected to do under this resolution, and also leave it free to some extent to determine the way in which it will carry out this very difficult task.

Mr. OLDENBROEK: It will obviously take some time for the I.L.O. to work out an International Charter. What form that will have to take will have to be determined from time to time, but what I should like to ask is this. If we adopt Mr. Weaver's text, would that mean that it is left to the discretion of the Office to determine how it is going to do that work? For instance, if the seamen's organisations asked the Office for specific information to be distributed to the different countries, would the Office undertake to do that? The same would apply, of course, to specific information on any subject which was wanted by the shipowners.

The reasons for the resolution were given yesterday; there are differences in legislation which we feel are unnecessary. If only the Governments would consult one another, it would be possible to bring about the uniformity which is so necessary in the shipping world.

Mr. WEAVER: In reporting on the work of the Joint Maritime Commission to the Governing Body, it will of course be necessary for the Office to make proposals for the carrying out of all the wishes expressed by the Joint Maritime Commission in these resolutions; and it will, of course, be subject to the directions of the Governing Body that the Office will do this work. I have not the slightest doubt that any desire expressed either by the shipowners or by the seafarers on the lines indicated just now by Mr. Oldenbroek will be given every consideration, and that the Office will do its utmost to meet such wishes.

Ninth Sitting, 30 June 1942

(The resolution was adopted unanimously and without further discussion in the form in which it is given in Part III.)

Conditions of Service of Seafarers

Seventh Sitting, 29 June 1942

(This resolution, submitted by the seamen's group, was adopted unanimously, after a drafting change suggested by the shipowners, group, in the form in which it is given in Part III.)

Organisation of Merchant Fleets*Seventh Sitting, 29 June 1942*

(This resolution, submitted by the seamen's group, was adopted unanimously in the form in which it is given in Part III. The discussion was limited to the following explanation of the intentions of the movers.)

Mr. JARMAN: We do not ask the Office to publish this, but we want a statement prepared for the next Maritime Commission. This surely requires no more than formal moving. We appreciate that any question of publication during the war might cause apprehension, but we want a document to show us what has been done during the war in this way, to see how far that might be applied to peacetime conditions. If it is possible to do these things in wartime, some of them, at any rate, might be done in peacetime.

Mr. SNEDDEN: We are quite prepared to agree to this.

The CHAIRMAN: At present the Office might be in difficulty in getting the information from countries.

Mr. JARMAN: We appreciate that.

International Agreements on the Utilisation of Merchant Shipping*Seventh Sitting, 29 June 1942*

(This resolution, submitted by the seamen's group, was adopted unanimously, in the form in which it is given in Part III. Certain drafting changes were made in the original text as a result of the following discussion.)

Mr. SNEDDEN: We feel that you are on rather dangerous ground here, and we suggest that this should be dropped. You are dealing with something very near to a military secret. Our own agreements are not published. We have sometimes wanted to see them ourselves and have not been allowed to do so, and I should hesitate very much to ask for this information.

Mr. BOWDEN: I thought that that matter had been settled when we dealt with the previous resolution. Anything which gave information to the enemy would not be disclosed until it was no longer of any service to them.

Mr. JARMAN: We could say "a future meeting of the Commission" instead of "the next meeting".

Mr. PRICE: Could it be left to the discretion of the Office? There is certain information which is publicly known. After the war, there will need to be a certain amount of international agreement and international regulation affecting shipping; we shall not be able to avoid it. Unless we are to go back to the bad old days of cutting each other's throat we shall have to have some kind of arrangement with regard to shipping. Quite what form that will take we do not know, but we do know that during the war there have been certain understandings arrived at between the Allied nations, and any of that information which it is proper to obtain we thought would be useful in view of the fact that after the war there will need to be some kind of understanding and arrangement between the different countries which have won the war. It is only that which we had in mind.

Mr. SNEDDEN: I think we all have the same object in mind. I have not consulted my group at all, but I think that we should be willing to agree to this with a change in line 3, where we should say "a statement of *any public information available* on the international agreements . . ." and so on.

Mr. WEAVER: It will be difficult to collect the information to give effect to these last two resolutions during the war. I understand that in adopting the earlier resolution you rather had in view the collection of information which would ultimately be of use in considering post-war conditions, and probably the same applies here.

Mr. JARMAN: Can I help at once by accepting Mr. Snedden's suggestion?

Mr. WEAVER: Public information is something which could be prepared even in wartime, but if you have in view something more complete than that, the purpose of which is to guide post-war policy, this is a resolution which could be placed on record and carried out when the circumstances were favourable.

Mr. OLDENBROEK: The intention of these two resolutions and of the resolution on the International Charter too, is to reaffirm what was decided at the New York Conference. The New York Conference adopted a resolution relating to consulting all interested organisations, institutions and individuals, in order that at the end of the war plans will be available for the immediate regulation of economic and social conditions in the mercantile marine. That is an instruction by an International Labour Conference, and we are trying to implement that by asking the International Labour

Office to undertake certain investigations, so that that material will be available in due time.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you for that explanation. I might just add to it that we are really asking the Governing Body to instruct the Office, so that it will all come under consideration.

Mr. OLDENBROEK: Yes.

The Shipping Industry and the Peace Conference

Ninth Sitting, 30 June 1942

(A resolution on this subject, submitted by the shipowners' group, was adopted unanimously without discussion in the form in which it is given in Part III.)

Closing Speeches

Ninth Sitting, 30 June 1942

The CHAIRMAN: I think that all members of this Commission have every right to be thoroughly satisfied with the work they have done. At any rate I hope we have brought to an end for ever the era of deadlocks of which I have heard so much. I must say that, having regard to what I had read of the proceedings in the past, I approached the meeting with trepidation, and I should like to thank the members of the Commission for the kindness and consideration with which I have been treated in what is a new post to me.

I feel that this Commission, meeting at a time when our seamen are giving their lives so bravely in keeping this world open until we can finally destroy the evil forces which are now trying to dominate it, is giving new hope to these men that they are really going to take a new place among the communities of the world. My Minister to-day said all that it was necessary to say on that subject; but it means much hard work and I myself feel very glad that you are to continue for the time being at any rate as a collective organisation, and I hope you will continue with fresh minds, and not with minds trammelled by recollections of the past. Unless those who are acting on behalf of employers and workers are prepared to act with fresh minds they will certainly be replaced by those who have fresh minds, washed by the great experience of this dreadful war.

I look forward to the future of seamen with very great hope and I believe that the way in which seamen are dealt with, and one or two other occupations such as agriculture, mining, and the primary producers generally are treated, will show whether there will be a new world or not.

I wish to thank you all again for the kindness you have shown me.

Mr. HUDIG: It is my privilege to propose a vote of thanks to the Chairman. You, sir, can feel assured that I speak on behalf of this meeting when I thank you most heartily for the way in which you have been coaching us. To be a good chairman is not an easy task and it requires four qualities; the first is tact, the second understanding, the third knowledge and the fourth insight into the problems and grasping the atmosphere. I speak on behalf of all of us, and most emphatically state that you have fulfilled these four qualifications. We have all felt that because of your able knowledge of the problems you have been an extremely good guide for us. I move a vote of thanks to Sir Frederick Leggett for the extremely good and constructive work which he has done.

Mr. JARMAN: On behalf of the workers' group I wish to second that resolution wholeheartedly, and thank you, sir, for the helpful and skilful manner in which you have assisted us. Like all my group I have endeavoured to make certain that the promises which have been made and the tributes which have been paid shall be interpreted into something more than words. We do not ask for the impossible; we have demanded, however, that never again will the seamen's conditions be allowed to revert to pre-war conditions. In fact, we are determined that they shall not. From some of the utterances on the operators' side—Mr. Curran has got me going in the American style—I am quite sure that we will not. I am grateful that the conference has been so happily handled, for the reason that it has brought us into closer contact with our American brothers and our group would like me to thank the Office staff for the help we have received from them.

In conclusion I would like to say that those of us who, like myself, have attended this Commission for the first time will go away convinced that we have done a real job of work for our men—the best and most deserving body of men in the world, our seamen.

Mr. SNEDDEN: I have been asked to say a few words on behalf of the shipowners' group. We have brought the convoy into port on schedule, but I, too, would like to pay my tribute to the American delegation. They must be tired of these tributes, but it is a signifi-

cant fact that we have had such a full and strong delegation. Commander Lee we knew and respected, but we know him even more and respect him even more after this meeting. Mr. Curran and Mr. Weisberger have learned a little from us, and we have learned much from the delegation as a whole.

I do not think we should let this meeting pass without paying some tribute and making references of sympathy and encouragement to absent friends. There are many faces which under peacetime conditions would have been here at this Commission, and we hope we shall see many of them again at a date not too far distant and under much happier conditions.

On every hand, in the Commission and in the corridors outside, there is a general impression that this meeting has been a success. That is our impression; I am sure it is everyone's impression. We have done two things; we have achieved practical results and also the very fact that we have held a meeting of the Commission is of immense psychological importance. It has given a demonstration to the world that the seafarers and the seamen are determined to carry this fight to a successful conclusion; victory depends now more than ever upon shipping and we have demonstrated that to that end we are absolutely united.

Mr. WEAVER: I should like to thank you, sir, and the Commission for your reference to the work which the staff has accomplished in preparing for this meeting.

It will give me great pleasure to report to the Acting Director on the proceedings of this Commission, on its results, and the spirit and atmosphere in which the discussions have been carried on. I am sure he will be extremely gratified at all I am able to tell him.

If I may add one personal recollection—I have been present at many meetings of the Joint Maritime Commission (Mr. Burge and I were present at the first meeting in 1920), and I can assure the Commission that the atmosphere now is very different from that which prevailed at that period. It has been a great pleasure to be present at these discussions. I am sure the Acting Director will do everything he can to carry out the spirit of the resolutions of this Commission.

Capt. COOMBS: On behalf of the workers' group I have to ask the members of the Governing Body to accept the thanks of the Commission for their presence here to-day. One hesitates to thank them in ordinary terms, but the fact that these two very solid columns of the edifice under which we work have been with us and taken an active and helpful part as members of the Governing

Body should not be overlooked, and it is the wish of neither side that they should be overlooked.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to thank you very sincerely for the very kind things you have said. I wanted to keep it dark, but Mr. Coombs has now exposed it; as a matter of fact you have noticed how closely the two members of the Governing Body have sat to my chair and I myself do owe them a very great deal. I have been scared lest I should go wrong and incur their criticism, but I am very grateful to them for the assistance they have given me, and for the high moral tone they have set in this atmosphere.

As we bring this Session to a close I think the last thought in our minds will be how glad we have been to meet together. Some of us, I at any rate, have made many new friends, and I think we cannot underestimate the value of these meetings in creating a personal knowledge of each other of those engaged in the same occupation and those engaged in Government and other spheres. We have behaved all through this meeting as friends, we part as friends, and I hope that before not too long those absent friends to whom Mr. Snedden has referred will be with us again and we shall be planning a new world instead of trying to save the wreckage of our present civilisation.

International Labour Review

A monthly review published in three editions, English, French and Spanish

Recent issues have included many articles of interest to seamen.

A specimen copy of the *Review* and a *Catalogue* of recent publications will be sent on application to the INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE, 3480 University Street, Montreal, Canada, or to any Branch Office or Correspondent.

The *International Labour Review* may also be obtained from the publishers in the United Kingdom, Messrs. George Allen & Unwin Ltd., Ruskin House, 40 Museum Street, London, W.C. 1.

Price: 60 cents; 2s. 6d.

Annual subscription: \$6.00; 24s.

Conventions and Recommendations affecting maritime employment adopted by the International Labour Conference 1920-1936

This volume contains the substance of the thirteen Conventions and eight Recommendations dealing with the conditions of employment of seamen which were adopted by the International Labour Conference from 1920 to 1936, and which together constitute what may be regarded as the International Seamen's Code. In addition, the volume gives the substance of two Conventions and two Recommendations relating to the handling of cargo which are of interest to seamen.

55 pp.

Price: 25 cents; 1s.

Life-Saving Measures for Merchant Seamen in Time of War

Statement prepared at the request of the Joint Maritime Commission with the assistance of the British Ministry of War Transport, presenting for the first time a concise exposition of the latest rules for protection of merchant seamen in wartime.

59 pp.

Price: 35 cents; 1s. 6d.

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE

Publications may be obtained at the following addresses:

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE, 3480 University Street, Montreal, Canada. ("Interlab, Montreal"; *Tel.* Plateau 2507.)

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE, Geneva, Switzerland.
("Interlab, Genève"; *Tel.* 2.62.00.)

BRANCH OFFICES:

China: Mr. HAI-FONG CHENG, P.O. Box 264, East Szechuan Post Office, Chungking. ("Interlab, Chungking"; *Tel.* 41703.)

France:

Great Britain: Mr. CLIFTON ROBBINS, 38 Parliament Street, London, S. W. 1. ("Interlab, Parl, London"; *Tel.* Whitehall 1437.)

India: Mr. P. P. PILLAI, International Labour Office (Indian Branch), New Delhi. ("Interlab, New Delhi"; *Tel.* 7567.)

United States: Miss ETHEL M. JOHNSON, 734 Jackson Place, Washington, 6, D.C. ("Interlab, Washington"; *Tel.* District 8736.)

CORRESPONDENTS:

Argentine Republic: Mr. LUIS LAUZET, Avenida Presidente Roque S. Peña 615 (9° Piso), Buenos Aires (*Tel.* 34 Defensa 4943); mailing address: calle San Juan 2245 (4° Piso B), Buenos Aires. ("Interlab, Buenos Aires".)

Bolivia: Mr. REMBERTO CAPRILES RICO, Avenida Aspiazu No. 310, La Paz.

Brazil: Mr. A. BANDEIRA DE MELLO, Ministerio do Trabalho, 11° andar, Rio de Janeiro, ("Interlab, Rio"; *Tel.* 42-0455.)

Chile: Mr. M. POBLETE TRONCOSO, Casilla 9411, Santiago de Chile ("Interlab, Santiago Chile"; *Tel.* 45-794.)

Colombia: Mr. ALFREDO VÁZQUEZ CARRIZOSA, Edificio de la Bolsa, Oficinas 503 y 504, Bogotá. ("Interlab-Bogotá")

Cuba: Mr. JOSÉ ENRIQUE DE SANDOVAL, Edificio la Metropolitana No. 813, Calle President Zayas, Havana. ("Interlab, Havana"; *Tel.* M. 78 13.)

Ecuador: Mr. V. G. GARCÉS, "El Día", Quito.

Iraq: Mr. HASHIM JAWAD, Ministry of Social Affairs, Baghdad.

Mexico: Mr. ENRIQUE JIMÉNEZ DOMÍNGUEZ, Venustiano Carranza 40, México, D.F.

Peru: Mr. ALEJANDRO DESMAISON, Casilla 577, Plaza San Martín 166, Lima.

Uruguay: Mr. ROGELIO CHERONI SAN ROMÁN, Juan Benito Blanco 3381, Montevideo

Venezuela: Mr. J. PÉREZ MACHADO, Avenida Los Mangos, Quinta "La Colina" (La Florida), Caracas. ("Interlab, Caracas.")

The Office also has representatives in the following countries:

Bulgaria, Sweden.

Publications of the International Labour Office

Subscription Rates and Prices

1. **INTERNATIONAL LABOUR REVIEW** (*Monthly*).
(Incorporating *Industrial and Labour Information*).
Articles on economic and social topics; current events, affecting industry and labour; statistics of employment, wages, cost of living, etc.
Price: per No., 60 cents, 2s. 6d.; per year, \$6.00, 24s.
2. **OFFICIAL BULLETIN** (*At irregular intervals*).
Official information on the work of the I.L.O.
Annual subscription: \$1 00, 4s.
3. **MINUTES OF THE GOVERNING BODY** (*At irregular intervals*).
Full records of discussions and decisions.
Annual subscription: \$2.50, 10s.
4. **LEGISLATIVE SERIES** (*Quarterly*).
Reprints and translations of laws and regulations.
Annual subscription: \$5 00, 20s.
5. **INDUSTRIAL SAFETY SURVEY** (*Quarterly*).
Problems of accident prevention.
Price: per No., 50 cents, 2s.; per year, \$1.50, 7s. 6d.
6. **DOCUMENTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE** (*Annual*).
Questionnaires and Reports, the Director's Report, Final Record, and texts of Draft Conventions and Recommendations.
Annual subscription: \$10.00, 40s.
7. **I.L.O. YEAR-BOOK**.
Survey of social and economic movements and labour legislation.
Price { *Paper bound* \$2.00, 8s.
 { *Cloth bound* \$3.00, 10s. 6d.
8. **YEAR BOOK OF LABOUR STATISTICS** (*Trilingual*).
Unemployment, Hours of Work, Wages, Prices, Migration, etc.
Price { *Paper bound* \$2.00, 8s.
 { *Cloth bound* \$3.00, 10s. 6d.
9. **INTERNATIONAL DIRECTORY OF CO-OPERATIVE ORGANISATIONS** (*At irregular intervals*). Tenth edition, 1939. \$1.00, 4s.
10. **STUDIES AND REPORTS**.
Works dealing with various labour problems, e.g., *Wages and Hours*, *Social Insurance*, *Industrial Relations*, *Economic Questions*, etc.
Annual subscription: \$7.50, 30s.

INCLUSIVE SUBSCRIPTION

To all publications given above:

\$30; £6 per year.

